

SCHOOL DETERMINANTS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION AMONG SOUTH AFRICAN ‘BORN FREES’

Catrina Laura Godinho (GDNCAT001)

A dissertation submitted in the fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the
Degree of Master of Social Science in Political Science

Department of Political Studies

University of Cape Town

2016

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signed by candidate

Signature Removed

Signature: _____ Date: 22/07/2016

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I use the 2012 Cape Area Study - a survey of 2,518 Grade 11 students at 45 schools in the Cape Town metropolitan area - to explore school determinants of political engagement and participation among South Africa's first post-apartheid generation, the 'born frees'. I ask whether schools have had an impact on 'born free' students' civic engagement and the likelihood that they will participate in legal and illegal political activity, as well as voting in elections. Despite the legacies of the racially defined apartheid system, the current African National Congress (ANC) government's failure to deliver on their promise of equal, quality and democratic education for all, and the enduring crisis in basic education, I find that the school can have a positive influence on political engagement and attitudes toward political participation. In this regard, the school characteristics that have the greatest influence are: the frequency with which politics is discussed across classes, the level of participation in school governance and other organisations, and extent to which the school environment is fair and caring. In addition, the school contributes to the development of internal efficacy and a procedural (rather than instrumental) understanding of democracy, both of which positively impact political engagement and attitudes toward political participation. Socio-economic status and race have a relatively small impact, which is reassuring given South Africa's history and the persistently high level of socio-economic inequality. Intriguingly, where socio-economic status and race are significant, it is the wealthier and previously advantaged groups who are less likely to be politically engaged and to have participative attitudes toward political activities, with the exception of voting.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Robert Mattes, for his support and guidance. I would also like to thank the following institutions for offering me the funds necessary to complete this research: Democracy in Africa Unit (CSSR) and the National Research Foundation.

To my friends and family, thank you for your unwavering humour and support.

To my father, Hilton Trollip, thank you for everything.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ANC African National Congress
C2005 Curriculum 2005
CAS 2012 Cape Area Study 2012
CASS Continuous Assessment
CED Cape Education Department
DET Department of Education and Training
GNU Government of National Unity
IND Independent/Private Schools
HOR House of Representatives
NP National Party
OBE Outcomes Based Education
WCED Western Cape Education Department

CONTENTS

DECLARATION	I
ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
LIST OF ACRONYMS	IV
CONTENTS	V
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA.....	1
THE EDUCATION & DEMOCRACY LITERATURE: RATIONALE	5
CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	9
CHAPTER 2: CONTINUITY, CONTRADICTION & CRISIS IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION SYSTEM	13
COLONIAL ROOTS & THE ACT OF UNION	13
APARTHEID SEGREGATION	14
TRANSITION & REFORM.....	15
<i>Institutional Reform.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Teacher Education and Training</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>17</i>
THE ON-GOING CRISIS.....	18
CHAPTER 3: EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS.....	21
THE SCHOOL IN EDUCATING FOR POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION	21
<i>The 'Modern School' Perspective.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>The 'Democratic School' Perspective.....</i>	<i>25</i>
CHAPTER 4: ARGUMENT AND RESEARCH DESIGN	28
THE CAPE AREA STUDY PROJECT 2012	28
VARIABLES	29
<i>Dependent Variables: Four Components of Political Engagement and Participation</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Independent Variables: The 'Modern School' Model.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Independent Variables: The 'Democratic School' Model.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Background Variables: South African Schools and Students.....</i>	<i>36</i>
ARGUMENT	37
<i>Descriptive Hypotheses.....</i>	<i>38</i>

<i>Primary Research Hypotheses: The Role of the School in Educating for Political Engagement and Participation.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Intervening and Background Variables</i>	<i>41</i>
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS	43
DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH RESULTS.....	43
<i>'Born Free' Political Engagement and Disposition Toward Political Participation</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>The South African Schooling Landscape.....</i>	<i>47</i>
PRIMARY RESEARCH RESULTS.....	51
<i>Students' Disposition Toward Legal Participation</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Students' Disposition Toward Illegal Participation.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Students' Disposition Toward Voting.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Students' Political Engagement.....</i>	<i>61</i>
KEY RESULTS.....	64
<i>A Political Education: Political Discussion at School.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Civic Identity: Internal Efficacy, Demand for Democracy and a Procedural Understanding of Democracy.....</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Inequality and Difference: An Apathetic Upper Class?.....</i>	<i>67</i>
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	69
SCHOOL DETERMINANTS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION.....	69
CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
APPENDIX A (PART 1): CAS 2012 SURVEY DESIGN AND FIELDWORK.....	75
1. <i>Project Description</i>	<i>75</i>
2. <i>The Sampling Methodology</i>	<i>76</i>
3. <i>The Field Work Process: The Learner and Teacher Survey</i>	<i>79</i>
4. <i>The Field Work Process: The Parent Survey.....</i>	<i>86</i>
5. <i>The Data Capturing Process.....</i>	<i>87</i>
APPENDIX A (PART 2): CAS 2012 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE CODE BOOK.....	89
APPENDIX A (PART 3): CAS 2012 SCHOOL FORM.....	116
APPENDIX B: VARIABLES - FACTOR AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS & ANOVA	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation, I explore the role of the school in processes of political socialisation and civic education in South Africa. In particular, I focus on the extent to which the school environment and civic education courses influence young post-apartheid South Africans –the ‘born frees’ - attitudes toward political engagement and participation. Past research has explored the relationship between individual characteristics, including level of education and educational experience, and political attitudes and behaviour (Mattes, Denmark & Niemi, 2012). In this dissertation, I add to the literature by investigating the means by and extent to which school characteristics influence ‘born frees’ political engagement and dispositions toward legal and illegal political activity, as well as voting in elections. In doing so, I aim to contribute to the still sparse research into education for democracy in young, developing democracies, specifically South Africa.

In this chapter, I introduce the challenges encountered in educating for democracy in post-apartheid South Africa, frame the research problem and identify my guiding research questions. I then proceed to explore the rationale of the research by referring to the broader education and democracy literature. At the end of this chapter, I provide a chapter summary, offering the reader an overview of the structure and course of the dissertation.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

Beginning in 1995, the African National Congress (ANC) government instituted both broad reforms and targeted interventions to ‘democratise’ South African political culture. The previous education system, a linchpin of Apartheid oppression and social engineering, was completely overhauled. Equal, quality and democratic public education was identified as a lever of socio-economic and socio-political transformation, and thus prioritised. To educational reformists, education had to be for democracy. This meant that South African schools not only had to teach students about democracy, they had to become democratic (Harber and Mncube, 2012: 130).

However, the mammoth educational reforms promulgated by the ANC government proved beyond the state’s capacity to implement. The education system has been, and continues to be, in a state of crisis. While the legacies of apartheid should not be understated or overlooked, the new government is not without fault. Education

policies, specifically those crafted in the wake of the transition, have been described as ‘politically symbolic’, rather than contextually informed, pragmatic, and implementable (Jansen, 2001 cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 154; Harley & Wedekind, 2004; Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 61). “As it stands [today], the South African education system is grossly inefficient, severely underperforming and egregiously unfair” (Spaull, 2013: 3). Weak governance, corruption, and political scandal are common across all levels, from the national education department down to the classroom, and pervasive socio-economic inequality continues to constrain educational opportunities and outcomes for most of the population (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 173). The majority of South African school students have an inadequate grasp of the curriculum, including basic numeracy and literacy skills, at all grades and ages (Spaull, 2013: 3). In addition to poor performance, schools are regularly found to be ‘untransformed’ in their governance structures, the roles and characteristics of school organisations, and the relationships of power between different actors within the school (Harber & Mncube, 2012; Karlsson, 2002; Mafora, 2013). In many instances, schools are sites “of cultural politics that serve to reproduce and perpetuate” an undemocratic political culture, with students and teachers experiencing schools as “fraught with unfairness, inequality, disregard for human rights and intolerance for diversity” (Mafora, 2013: 3). Disappointingly, the ANC’s promise of equal, quality and democratic public education has not been kept.

The failure of these reforms has troubling, if poorly understood, implications for South Africa’s political culture and its nascent democracy. In the twenty years since the transition to democracy, there appears to have been little generational change in key indicators of democratic political culture between those who grew up during apartheid and those who have been educated and socialised under a new system. In fact, “rather than re-drawing the country’s main cleavages¹ along lines of age and generation (as in post-war Germany), many of the key fault lines of apartheid (such as race, urban-rural residence, class, and poverty) have been replicated within the new

¹ In political values, attitudes and behaviour.

² In 1910, the previously separate colonies of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Orange River Colony and Transvaal became the Union of South Africa, constituted by the British Parliament in 1909. It was repealed in 1961, when South Africa became a republic. (Giliomee & Mbenga, 2007).

* Testing for validity and reliability, I applied a maximum likelihood extraction and direct oblimin rotation factor analysis for each of the variable constructs and indices below, guaranteeing that if a

generation” (Mattes, 2012: 19). Across cohorts, South Africans are found to be minimally supportive of democracy and their understanding of democracy is often instrumental (Mattes & Richmond, 2015: 2). South Africans “exhibit particularly low levels of political efficacy and actual engagement with the political system”, and “some of the lowest levels of conventional political participation in Africa” (Mattes & Richmond, 2015: 2). Some forms of political participation have actually decreased over the past twenty years of democracy, with voter turnout falling by 35 percentage points between the 1994 and 2014 elections, as has interest and participation in election campaigns (Mattes & Richmond, 2015: 2). Assuming that regime stability and persistence are dependent on a congruent political culture, and that the quality and nature of a democratic regime is reflective of its civic culture, the failure of the new government to develop a supportive and participative democratic political culture through education is worrying (Almond & Verba, 1963; Putnam, 1993; Eckstein, 1966).

Nonetheless, education has been found to play at least some role in the development of young South Africans’ political attitudes in recent quantitative research. Looking at the possible impact of education and schooling on citizenship attitudes, values and behaviour, Mattes, Denemark and Niemi find that “various parts of the educational process can indeed make students ‘more democratic’” or more likely to ‘demand democracy’ (Mattes, Denemark & Niemi, 2012: 2). Factors related to the transmission of political knowledge and, to a lesser extent, school characteristics such as the classroom environment are found to be especially significant (Mattes, Denemark & Niemi, 2012:2).

That teaching young South Africans about the political system and democracy is a possible avenue to increasing popular commitment to democracy is encouraging, yet it would be perilous to assume that factors related to the ‘transmission of political knowledge’ or ‘demand for democracy’ also translate into political engagement and participation or other democratic values, such as trust, tolerance and non-discrimination. In previous research into the efficacy of civic education in South Africa, Finkel and Enrst (2006) caution that “the primary factors that promote successful learning in one area of civic education, the imparting of basic factual political knowledge, are not likely to be the same factors that promote successful learning in other, more value-based and attitudinal realms” (67). Further,

understanding the role of (civic) education and school experience as a mediating factor in the process of ‘political socialisation’, Mattes, Denemark & Niemi also caution that “economic security and confidence in the economic system [are] also [found to be] significantly related to democratic attitudes” (2012: 20).

Faced with multiple challenges to educating for democracy in South Africa, this dissertation focuses on the role of the school in educating for political engagement and participation, an essential component of a supportive democratic political culture. This component is especially relevant in the South African context, where democratic commitment remains uncertain among younger generations. A recent cross-national investigation into the relationship between political behaviour and attitudes finds that citizens in young democracies “learn by doing” (Bratton, 2009: 15). In other words, political engagement and participation actually lead to the development of democratic attitudes and values (Bratton, 2009: 15). In addition, it adds to the current literature by providing a ‘map’ of (civic) education and school culture that explores possible relationships between structural cleavages (race, urban/rural, socio-economic etc.), the educational experience of ‘born free’ school students and political culture.

Uncertain of the ‘born frees’ commitment to democracy and democratic attitudes, values and behaviour, and aware of the crisis in basic education and schooling, it is critical to explore if and how schools can inculcate politically engaged and participative dispositions among school students, even where they may struggle in transmitting political knowledge. In order to do so, I pose and address a number of questions in this dissertation.

Firstly, what does extant literature tell us about education and schooling in South Africa that can be used to identify the challenges and opportunities posed to educating ‘born free’ school students for political engagement and participation?

Secondly, what perspectives can be drawn from the political culture, political socialisation and civic education literature in order to frame the different ways that the school might prepare students for and encourage democratic, engaged and participative citizenship?

Lastly, to what extent are ‘born frees’ politically engaged and positively disposed toward political participation? How have South African schools influenced the ‘born frees’ political engagement and political participation profile? Specifically, what

school characteristics positively contribute to the development and inculcation of politically engaged and participative dispositions among ‘born free’ school students.

THE EDUCATION & DEMOCRACY LITERATURE: RATIONALE

Research into the relationship between education and democracy is built upon the longstanding ‘conventional wisdom’ that education has both direct and indirect effects on individual political attitudes, values and behaviour, and on a society’s political culture. As Aristotle wrote over two thousand years ago:

“[O]f all the safeguards that we hear spoken of as helping to maintain constitutional continuity the most important, but most neglected today, is education, that is educating citizens for the way of living that belongs to the constitution in each case. It is useless to have the most beneficial rules of a society fully agreed upon by all who are members of the politeia, if individuals are not going to be trained and have their habits formed for that politeia, that is to live democratically if the laws of the society are democratic, oligarchically if they are oligarchic” (Aristotle, 1962: 215 as cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 105).”

Education is seen as a means to inculcate in the citizenry, political attitudes, values and dispositions congruent with the political system. In most modern Western states, this has contributed to the proliferation of public education. Whether through the ‘teaching’ of desirable civic skills and knowledge, or through ‘socialisation’ into prevailing political attitudes, values, and behaviour, or even the ‘stratification’ of citizens through schooling and education, political education is one of the primary objectives of public education.

In any given democratic regime, ‘desirable’ citizenship characteristics are “bound to reflect competing and evolving conceptions of what democracy requires”, contingent on context, time and model of democracy (Galston, 2005:57). For example, working from a deliberative model of democracy in an established democracy that enjoys a small, homogenous and well-educated population, a premium would likely be placed on high levels of political knowledge and understanding, and critical engagement in political discussion and decision-making. In contrast, working from a representative model of democracy in a young democracy with a history of ethnic conflict and low average levels of formal education, values such as political tolerance, nationalism and

commitment to democracy may be prioritised. Nonetheless, there are a number of core characteristics around which there is some consensus, among which an engaged and participative disposition is central. If “[d]emocracy embodies the ideal that decisions affecting an association as a whole would be taken by all its members and that they would each have equal rights to take part in such decisions”, democratic citizens need to be engaged and participate (Beetham & Boyle, 1995). Additionally, and assuming that a positive disposition towards political engagement and participation leads to actual participation, “mass democratic attitudes are learned from participatory behaviour, rather than vice-versa” (Finkel, 1987 & Bratton et al., 2005, cited in Bratton, 2009: 2). A key element of education for democracy is thus education for participation, especially in contexts where democratic support and associated attitudes are uncertain.

Across the research literature, higher levels of education are found to have an almost universally positive relationship with political engagement and participation, as well as other commonly ‘desirable’ citizenship traits. Looking to some of the most cited works in the ‘political culture’ literature, education is treated as essential to democratic citizenship (Converse, 1972: 324; Almond & Verba, 1963; Marsh & Kaase, 1979; Putnam, 2000). In 1972, Converse argued that:

“[w]hether one is dealing with cognitive matters such as level of factual information about politics or conceptual sophistication in its assessment; or such motivational matters as degree of attention paid to politics and emotional involvement in political affairs; or questions of actual behaviour, such as engagement in any variety of political activities from party work to vote turnout itself: education is everywhere the universal solvent, and the relationship is always in the same direction. The higher the education, the greater the ‘good’ values of the variable. The educated citizen is attentive, knowledgeable, and participatory and the uneducated citizen is not” (324).

This is echoed throughout the literature. More recently, Putnam finds that:

“[e]ducation is one of the most important predictors- usually, in fact, the most important predictor- of many forms of social participation- from voting to associational membership, to chairing a local committee to hosting a dinner party to giving blood. The same basic pattern applies in both men

and women and to all races and generations. Education, in short, is an extremely powerful predictor of civic engagement' (2000: 186).

However, this 'conventional wisdom' has been called into question in recent decades by the evinced decrease in civic engagement and political participation across many developed democracies despite increasing average levels of education (Putnam, 2000). In addition, its applicability to younger democracies with uncertain democratic political cultures has yet to be established. In South Africa, past research has in fact found that higher levels of education do not translate into higher levels of political tolerance or support for democracy (Gibson, 2005; Bratton, Mattes & Gyimah-Boadi, 2005). This has led scholars to question what it is about education and schooling that affects political engagement and participation later in life, and to what extent these operate in different socio-political contexts, whether post-industrial or developing.

In recent decades, researchers have revisited and found support for the impact of increased cognitive capacity and the transmission of political knowledge on political engagement and participation, mainly through the curriculum (Nie & Junn, 1998; Westholm, Lindquist & Niemi, 1990; Denver & Hands, 1990; Torney-Purta et al. 2002). In addition to the traditional focus on the content (formal curriculum) of civic education, researchers have also attended to what and how students learn (informal curriculum) and the role of the school/classroom environment (hidden curriculum) in political socialisation (Galston, 2001; Campbell, 2006; Dewey, 1938). This research has two main theoretical strands. In the first, the (Western-style, public) school is thought to provide students with the "modern bureaucratic and organisational skills, attitudes and values" necessary for interaction with government bureaucracy and "upon which more explicitly democratic values might be built" (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 109; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980: 78; Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995). In the second, the socio-cultural educational context, whether authoritarian, democratic or otherwise, is thought to acculturate students into the norms, values and practices of society through the micro-society of the school (Campbell, 2006: 73). Cross-national quantitative research provides evidence that the school influences students' dispositions toward political engagement and participation through the curriculum, classroom climate and school culture (Torney-Purta et al. 2002).

In the South African context, there is reason to expect that the culture of the school can influence the likelihood that 'born free' students will become politically engaged

and participative. As outlined above, and as will be expanded upon in Chapter 2, the ANC government identified public education and schooling as a means to increase human capital (cognitive capacity and skills), create “a ‘modern’ society [...] by means of an efficient, professional and well managed education system” and help “to create a democratic and peaceful society” (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 130). This is clear in statements made by the ANC and Department of Education in the 1990s:

“It should be a goal of education and training policy to enable a democratic, free, equal, just and peaceful society to take root and prosper in our land, on the basis that all South Africans without exception share the same inalienable rights, equal citizenship, and common national destiny, and that all forms of bias (especially racial, ethnic and gender) are dehumanising.” (Department of Education, 1995: 22, cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 130).

The new government thus sought to introduce democracy into the “the intellectual culture [of] all schools and educational institutions”, which would have “unavoidable implications for curricula, textbooks, other educational materials and media programmes, teaching methods, teacher education, professional supervision and management culture” (Department of Education, 1995: 43, cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 130).

Although educational reforms over the past two decades have been unevenly implemented and the legacies of socio-economic inequality persist, the education system and schools are no longer instruments of the apartheid state. Instead, the new government has endeavoured to provide equal, quality and democratic education for all young South Africans. While this goal remains elusive, and the crisis in education continues as one of the greatest impediments to socio-economic development, it is probable that the effort to democratise and modernise education has had some impact on South African schools. Where this is the case and aspects of education and schooling break with the authoritarianism of the past or reinforce pre-existing elements of democratic political culture, the broader literature gives cause to believe that this may positively influence school students’ political attitudes, values and behaviour. With the first ‘born frees’ graduating high school in 2012, we can now ask whether or not the school can and has had an impact on the likelihood that ‘born free’ student’s will be politically engaged and predisposed to political participation.

Investigating the means by and extent to which this is the case is the aim of this dissertation. To provide an overview of my approach and the dissertation that follows, I provide a chapter summary in the next section.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter 2 consists of four sections, through which I trace the parallel evolution of the South African education and political systems up until today. In the first section, I highlight the development of racially defined public education, which followed the 1910 Act of Union², effectively protecting and advancing the interests of European South Africans. In the second section, I show how the National Party used education as a tool of segregation, oppression and indoctrination under apartheid. In the third section, I provide an overview of the education reform process, and the forces that shaped it, during the democratic transition in the 1990s. Finally, I discuss the enduring education crisis. Through providing a political history of education and schooling in South Africa in this chapter, I show that the legacies of racial segregation, oppression and authoritarianism continue to be central to understanding the education system. From this situational analysis, the following question emerges: with the ANC's promise of equal, quality and democratic education for all far from realisation, how have and can schools inculcate in 'born frees' the attitudes, values and dispositions toward democracy and citizenship that are crucial to the development and consolidation of democratic political culture in South Africa?

In chapter 3, I look to the civic education literature and develop a framework from which to answer this question. In exploring how schools might matter, a number of school characteristics stand out in the literature. These characteristics can be divided into three groups. The first group centres on the resources available to and through the school, linking with socio-economic class and social cleavages such as race, gender and urban/rural divides. The second group centres on aspects of the school that are associated with 'modern education': impersonal rules-based bureaucratic organisation, academic performance and civics courses (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 20-

² In 1910, the previously separate colonies of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Orange River Colony and Transvaal became the Union of South Africa, constituted by the British Parliament in 1909. It was repealed in 1961, when South Africa became a republic. (Giliomee & Mbenga, 2007).

21; Inkeles, 1969; Leftwich, 1996; Campbell, 2006; Kendall, 2009). The third group centres on characteristics of the school that are associated with ‘democratic education’, such as: democratic decision-making, a participative ethos, open classroom climate, political discussion and debate, and fair and caring relationships (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970 & 1973, Ehman, 1980; Hunter, 1994, Sen 1999; Gatto, 2005). I focus on the latter two, advancing two perspectives on the way in which the school might influence students’ political values, attitudes and behaviour, the ‘modern school’ perspective and a ‘democratic school’ perspective, and consider their applicability in South Africa.

In chapter 4, I present the research design and argument. In the first section, I provide an overview of the Cape Area Study 2012 (CAS 2012), the dataset used in this analysis. I then go on to develop and operationalize the dependent and independent variables for the CAS 2012 dataset. The dependent variable, political engagement and participation, is broken down into four components. Because the CAS 2012 surveys Grade 11 students, who are still legal minors, the political participation components are captured as individuals’ dispositions toward participation rather than actual participation. The dependent variable components are thus student dispositions toward legal political participation, illegal participation, voting, and their current level of political engagement (interest in politics). I present the independent variables in three models. The first is the ‘modern school’ model. The second is the ‘democratic school’ model. The third comprises of school and student background variables. In the final section of the chapter, I present the descriptive and primary research hypotheses.

In chapter 5, I present the research results. In the first section I consider the descriptive results, describing Cape Town ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and participation profile, and then explore the Cape Town school landscape, charting socio-economic, demographic, ‘modern’, and ‘democratic’ school characteristics. I then go on to present the primary research results in the second section, providing a description of the regression results for each dependent variable component: disposition toward legal participation, disposition toward illegal participation, disposition toward voting and political engagement. In the last section of the chapter, I highlight the results that stand out across the regression analyses: the positive effect of frequent political discussion at school, the importance of internal efficacy, and the

negative relationship between higher socio-economic status and political engagement and participative dispositions.

In chapter 6, I reflect on the research problem, rationale and questions, review the results, and conclude with recommendations for future research. Overall, the analysis and results presented in this dissertation confirm that the school can and does influence ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and dispositions toward political participation. The school characteristic that most clearly stands out in this regard is the frequency with which politics is discussed at school. In addition, a participative ethos, or high levels of participation in school governance and organisations, and a fair and caring school environment correspond to positive dispositions toward voting and legal political participation, respectively. At the individual level, students who understand democracy as a process and who exhibit higher levels of internal efficacy, both characteristics thought to be influenced by the school and/or civic education, are more likely to be politically engaged and positively disposed toward all forms of political participation. Socio-economic status and race have a relatively small impact, which is reassuring given South Africa’s history and persistently high levels of socio-economic inequality. Intriguingly, where socio-economic status and race are significant, it is the wealthier and previously advantaged groups who are less likely to be politically engaged or to have participative attitudes toward political activities, with the exception of voting.

Going forward, it would be worthwhile to test the strength of the relationship between the ‘born frees’ political engagement and attitudes toward political participation during adolescence, and actual civic and political participation in adult life. Although previous research finds a strong relationship in other contexts, the systemic institutional, educational and resource inequality in South Africa may distort this relationship. In addition, it would be worthwhile to test the findings presented in this dissertation in the other large metropolitan areas (Durban, Johannesburg and Pretoria), as well as rural areas. Due to differences in provincial government, socio-economic conditions, and possibly cultural and/or historical legacies, the results may differ significantly. Lastly, deeper analysis into the differences that exist between schools, beyond the already well-traversed intersection of race, socio-economic status and academic performance, may be revealing. The enduring crisis in education has contributed to a stark portrayal of functional vs dysfunctional schools. However, the

analysis presented in this thesis indicates a more varied school landscape, specifically with regards education for political engagement and participation.

CHAPTER 2: CONTINUITY, CONTRADICTION & CRISIS IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

From the outset of the democratic transition, the African National Congress (ANC) identified education as a primary lever of socio-economic transformation and democratisation. In the wake of the 1994 democratic elections, the ANC led Government of National Unity (GNU) introduced sweeping education reforms. The expectation was that the successful provision of equal, quality and democratic education would contribute to remedying systemic inequality and counteracting the authoritarianism of the past - inculcating in the first generation of 'born free' South African's the modern and democratic attitudes, values and behaviour needed for democratic consolidation and economic development (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 129). However, twenty years since, "deep historical patterns are seemingly unaffected by new policies" and the education system continues to reflect the legacies of the past (Chrisholm, 2012: 99). In order to understand the current state of the education system and the way in which it might influence the political socialisation of 'born frees', it is thus necessary to trace the joint evolution of the South African political and education systems (Fiske & Ladd, 2004). In this chapter, I do so through four chronologically ordered sections: Colonial Roots and the Act of Union, Apartheid Segregation, Transition and Reform, and the On-going Crisis.

COLONIAL ROOTS & THE ACT OF UNION

Universal public schooling was gradually introduced in South Africa over the first decades of the 20th century, gaining momentum following the 1910 Act of Union. However, this expansion was advanced only to White children. The majority of the non-European and native African population did not have access to basic or higher educational institutions, with the exception of those who attended missionary schools - most often for only a few years. Through these and other policies, the Union extended and institutionalised the pattern of racial inequality and segregation that had emerged in the colonies, effectively excluding Africans from economic and civic life (Chrisholm, 2012: 84).

APARTHEID SEGREGATION

Inheriting an already segregated and unequal education system in 1948, the National Party further entrenched racist, sexist and conservative Christian schooling, initially through the Bantu Education Act of 1953, and later through the Christian National Education Act of 1962, the Education for Coloured People's Act of 1965, and the Education for Indians Act of 1969. As a result of the Bantu Education Act, most black mission schools were forced to close due to drastic cuts in government funding to non-state schools. Those that did not close fell under the jurisdiction of the Apartheid government, with few exceptions. With most schools under the control of the Afrikaner dominated National Party (NP), "the aims of education were explicitly to maintain white superiority and dominance in the economy and state" (Chrisholm, 2012: 85). Schools became one of the main levers through which racial segregation and socio-economic repression of non-white groups was perpetrated, and provided the foundation for an authoritarian political culture.

Apartheid schools were segregated according to race, in terms of who could attend or teach at the school, the 'group area' in which the school was located, and the way in which the school was funded by government. Hierarchical racial, urban/rural and gender roles were further imparted through subject choice, staff training, positions and payment, and the management of social space within schools (Christie 1986, cited in Carrim, 2006: 180). Schooling was heavily authoritarian, teacher dominated and, in an effect, an "anti-education" tool of apartheid indoctrination (Morrow 1986, cited in Carrim, 2006: 173). Citizenship education was limited and heavily enforced acceptance of the status quo (De Lange, Engelbrecht & Taunyane, 1989: 236-238; South African National Department of Education, 2001:11). The authoritarian organisation of the school, austere social context, teacher centred pedagogy and Afrikaans nationalist curriculum together worked "to legitimise the prevailing social order and to teach students from various racial [and cultural, religious, gender etc.] groups about their proper place in that order" (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 45). Through schools, a "system of values which amongst other things promoted racial fears, hatred and conflict" was instilled, not only through segregation and the curriculum, but also through a culture of institutional violence and oppression (Chrisholm, 2001: 3).

'Non-white' schools were systematically under-resourced, over-crowded and inadequately managed by poorly trained teachers and administrators, and failed across

a range of education indicators (Fiske & Ladd, 2004). The impediments to formal education were insurmountable for the majority of the population, and only one tenth of the black African population progressed to secondary school in the 1960s (Chrisholm, 2012:86). While the 1970s saw a dramatic increase in secondary school attendance, this only exacerbated the problem of under-resourced and overcrowded schools, galvanising the young South Africans who would become the ‘struggle generation’. It was within this context that the introduction of Afrikaans as a compulsory language of instruction sparked the Soweto uprisings of 1976. In the wake of the uprisings, the school became a hotbed of political activity and organisation in many urban townships (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 47).

“Despite enormous class sizes, poorly trained teachers, and inadequate infrastructure and physical resources, schools in townships such as Soweto educated large numbers of literate, inquisitive, and activist-minded youths and readily facilitated building networks and associations. Such schools became “sites of expansion, of expectation, of deprivation and of explosive political potential” (Beinhart, 2001: 236)”. (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 48).

During the 1970s and 1980s, political resistance through school boycotts and student protest became the norm (Carrim, 2006: 180). Ironically, it was the very model of apartheid schooling, which had operationalized segregation and an authoritarian political culture, which catalysed political resistance to the system.

TRANSITION & REFORM

Towards the end of the 1980s, the apartheid regime was buckling under the pressure of prolonged internal resistance, international economic and political sanctions, and worsening economic performance. Recognising the inevitability of the collapse of the apartheid regime, the newly elected Prime Minister F W de Klerk lifted the ban on the ANC and other liberation parties, released political prisoners – including Nelson Mandela- and freed the press, spurring the transition to democracy. Between 1990 and 1993, a negotiated settlement between the NP, ANC and other political organisations provided the framework for this transition. The first national democratic elections were held in 1994, with the ANC winning an overwhelming majority.

While the negotiated settlement allowed for a peaceful transition from apartheid to democracy, the contradictory basis of the settlement – “to promote the interests of the

newly empowered black majority and to protect the [...] interests of the white minority”- had great bearing on post-1994 policy. Education policy was no exception. Under the pressures of the negotiated settlement, and amid multiple other challenges, including tight fiscal resources and capacity constraints, the newly elected ANC government legislated the South African School Act (1996) and the National Education Policy Act (1996), as well as a slew of other policies dealing with educator training and employment, school governance and funding, and the development of the new curriculum (Curriculum 2005 or C2005). Critics have since characterised these policies as political gestures or instruments, rather than “genuine educational reform”, arguing that they “did not emerge from debates within the education sector ... [or] arise from a ‘situational analysis’ of existing realities” (Jansen, 1999 cited in Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 170). Nonetheless, the reforms have fundamentally changed the system. Key aspects of this reform are outlined below.

Institutional Reform

To begin with, the institutional structure of the apartheid education system was overhauled. A single national education department and nine provincial departments have replaced the fifteen racially defined education departments of the apartheid system. Education policy, the curriculum, and norms and standards are now nationally determined, while provincial departments are responsible for implementation. Elected School Governing Bodies (SGBs), made up of local community members, teachers, parents and, at a secondary level, students, are responsible for individual school governance. This is due in part to low personnel and financial resources in provincial education departments, part to commitment to the ‘democratisation of schooling’, and part to the power leveraged by Whites during the negotiated settlement in order to “preserve as much of their former privilege as possible in the new social order [by maintaining] control over their schools” (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 69). State funding has been equalised, and the majority of schools have become fee-free as a result of the 2006 amendment to the National Norms and Standards of School Funding (Chrisholm, 2012: 93).

Teacher Education and Training

The new government attempted to remedy the disparity in teacher training and qualifications, first by an effort to redistribute teachers within the system and then by

shifting all teacher training to higher education facilities and out of ‘technical colleges’ (Chrisholm, 2012: 93). Both these approaches proved to be unsuccessful. Many teachers left the system to avoid redeployment and those wanting to join the teaching profession were discouraged by the limited student intake capacity, higher entry requirements, and cost of higher education institutions. A third effort to incentivise and encourage teacher education involved the introduction of bursaries, which has been somewhat more successful.

However, teachers are still by and large under-qualified, exhibit inadequate command of content and pedagogical methods, and have had difficulty meeting the requirements of C2005 (Chrisholm, 2012: 94; Spaul, 2013: 26). Recent studies testing teacher knowledge “provide a clear indication that teacher content knowledge is seriously lacking”, with one nationally representative study (SACMEQ III, 2007) showing that most Grade 6 teachers do not have an adequate command of the mathematics content that they are meant to teach (Spaul, 2013: 25). In addition, the poor performance of the majority of students across basic numeracy, literacy and subject specific tests indicates that teachers are unlikely to have an adequate command over content and pedagogical methods (Chrisholm, 2012: 94). Harber and Mncube (2012) cite a number of studies that find that teachers do not “have the conceptual resources” to turn the new student-centred pedagogy and broad outcomes of the C2005 into effective class activities, learning programmes and assessment methods (Vally, 1999 cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 144). Instead, the “majority of teachers continue to use traditional, teacher-centred methods of monologue and rote learning (Nelson Mandela Foundation, 2005 cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 144). This is especially the case where teachers face the additional challenges of overcrowded classrooms, insufficient resources (computers, teaching materials, printers etc.) and inadequate administrative assistance in poor schools and rural areas.

Curriculum

The curriculum underwent reforms in two phases. In the first, the multiple curriculums in use (by different departments) were condensed into one common curriculum. This curriculum was then purged of racist, sexist, and other offensive content in line with the new democratic regime and constitution. Lastly, continuous assessment (CASS) was introduced – the measurement of student’s progress

throughout the school year, as apposed to bi-/annual exams. In the second phase, the new national curriculum, Curriculum 2005 (C2005), was designed. Fiske and Ladd (2004) identify three requirements that C2005 had to meet, relating to both content and pedagogy (155). Firstly, “instruction had to reflect the *social values that define the new South Africa*” through reflecting the “emphasis in the new constitution on equity and human rights” (155). Secondly, “the content of the new curriculum had to be *nonauthoritarian*”, meaning that the school and community could “participate in shaping curriculum content” (155). Lastly, “the new curriculum needed to be *delivered in democratic way*” through student-centred pedagogy, active learning, and giving each student “some responsibility for the shaping of his or her own education” (155).

In 1997, C2005 was launched with a view to full implementation by 2005. In the design of C2005, the Department of Education opted for an ‘outcomes-based approach’ (OBE). In this approach, outcomes (“general knowledge, skills and values that learners should acquire”) are nationally determined in the curriculum, and then schools and teachers are expected to choose specific content, learning activities and strategies, and assessment methods depending on the teaching environment and students’ needs (Fiske & Ladd, 2004: 157). Included in the nationally determined ‘outcomes’, schools were charged with the responsibility of: nurturing a culture of communication and participation in schools, infusing classrooms with a culture of human rights, making education multilingual and multicultural, promoting anti-racism and anti-sexism, nurturing new patriotism and affirming common citizenship, and inculcating democratic values in the next generation (Department of Basic Education, 2001). In addition, “democratic values and principles”, as well as “a democracy element” were introduced as learning ‘outcomes’ for History (compulsory from Grade 4 to Grade 9 since 2001) and Life Orientation (a newly introduced subject, compulsory from Grade 10 to Grade 12 since 2001) following the review of C2005 in 2001 (Mattes, Denmark & Niemi, 2012: 4)

THE ON-GOING CRISIS

Some twenty years since legislation of the policies that sought to transform the entire education system, implementation continues to be uneven and undermined by severe inequality in human, material and financial resources between schools, communities

and provincial departments. While the legacies of the apartheid regime, and the colonial history which preceded it, go a long way in explaining failure to bring about the envisaged educational reform, the conditions under which the new education system was formed also have a significant bearing on the current situation. The complexity of reforming the education system and of ameliorating the systemic inequality of the apartheid system, in a context where the human, financial and material resources and capacity continue to fall short, have since become clear. The South African education system is in a state of perpetual crisis and dysfunction.

According to extensive quantitative research undertaken by Spaul (2013), a leading academic in the area of basic education, “the South African education system is grossly inefficient, severely underperforming and egregiously unfair” across indicators (Spaul, 2013: 3). The gap between historically advantaged and disadvantaged schools may have actually widened due to the inadequate implementation and administration of the overly complex, sophisticated and hastily developed policies of the 1990s and 2000s. The ‘resource hungry’ C2005 has floundered in disadvantaged schools facing multidimensional resource constraints and formal education outcomes may be worsening in a number of key areas (Harley and Wedekind, 2004: 206). Recent revisions have only made piecemeal improvements and implementation remains problematic and tied to the resources available to the school.

The distribution of academic performance is bimodal and bifurcated, with schools in the lower performing 75 per cent operating in a fundamentally different way to those in the better performing 25 per cent (Spaul, 2013). Splitting schools 75/25 according to academic outcomes reveals that performance is still tied to the divides of apartheid administration, socio-economic status and language. Students in the lower performing 75% face a “double burden”, “the burden of poverty (operating on both an individual and institutional-social levels) and [...] the burden of attending a school that still bears the scars of neglect and underfunding under the apartheid dispensation” (de Berg et al. 2011: 8). But the on-going crisis consists of more than poor and unequal academic performance; it comprises of a whole barrage of contributing and equally concerning factors. These include high levels of crime and violence in schools (including gender based and sexual violence, drug abuse and gangsterism), corruption (from the top most levels of government to relations between teachers and students),

depressed educator motivation and morale, under-qualified and regularly absent teachers, poor school infrastructure, amenities and physical resources, and strained community relations (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 132). In South Africa, there are thus at least two different education systems, which mirror the ‘two South Africas’ evinced in the structure of the economy (Spaull, 2013; de Berg et al. 2011: 3). This bifurcated education system contributes to an intergenerational cycle, which limits socio-economic mobility and transformation, effectively maintaining the divides of the past.

The project of transforming the education system, and transforming society through education, rests on “changing the vast webs of practice which constitute it” (Morrow, 2001 cited in Harley & Wedekind, 2004). The failure of policy makers, government and South African society to address the contextual and cultural disparities of the inherited schooling system, as well as the capacity and resource constraints that characterise schools and education departments, has undermined this project. As a result, the effects of apartheid segregation and racial stratification can still be seen in many facets of South African education system today; in the enduring disparities between school’s resource endowments, staff training and qualifications, and academic performance (See: Spaull, 2013; Soudien, 2007), and the persistence of authoritarianism in school culture (Weeks, 2012; Ngcobo, 2008; Spaull, 2013; Soudien, 2007), organisation, and governance (Mncube, 2013; Mncube & Harber, 2010; Karlsson, 2002; Sayed, 2002).

Aware of the legacies of apartheid and the steep challenges posed by the current education crisis, what role can the school play in educating for democracy, specifically political engagement and participation? Through this chapter, I have provided the context crucial to understanding and answering this question. In the remaining chapters, I present the research framework, design, and results.

CHAPTER 3: EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

In this chapter, I frame two perspectives on the role of the school in educating for democracy and consider each in the South African context. The first is the ‘modern school perspective’ and reflects current literature that assesses the ‘functionality’ of South African schools in meeting academic outcomes and operating according to the norms of modern, bureaucratic educational institutions. The second is ‘the democratic school perspective’ and focuses on the school community and social context, specifically the extent to which the educational experience is democratic, participative and political. The complex and unequal character of the South African education system means that most schools likely fall somewhere on a continuum with regards to the characteristics associated with each perspective. Therefore, applying both in exploring the role that the school plays in educating for democracy allows for a holistic exploration of school determinants of political engagement and participation among the ‘born free’ generation.

THE SCHOOL IN EDUCATING FOR POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION

As the primary public setting in which people spend the majority of their time during childhood and adolescence, the school is a unique institution through which to influence the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and behaviour of citizens - shaping political culture and the functioning of the polity. As such, the school is expected to provide civic education in addition to providing basic education. Even though schools are commonly ascribed the responsibility of educating young citizens for democracy, there is some dispute about the ways in which schools can and should do this (See: De Groof et al. 2008; Biedermann, Shavelson & Oser, 2008; Galston, 2001; Kavadias & De Maeyer, 2007; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001). Looking to the literature, I suggest two perspectives on the school’s role in this regard. The first, with its roots in modernisation theory, is the ‘modern school’ perspective. The second, drawn mainly from political sociology, is the ‘democratic school’ perspective. Each perspective identifies distinct school characteristics that are thought to contribute to the development of cognitive capacity, including political knowledge, and the socialisation of certain values, attitudes and behavioural norms. Each perspective is

imbedded in and informed by certain ideas around what democratic citizenship requires in terms of engagement and participation. These have been surmised in the table below, and expanded upon in the following sub-sections.

Table 3.1 Perspectives on the School's Role in Educating for Democratic Citizenship

<u>The Modern School Perspective</u>	
The school provides formal education in a strict bureaucratic setting as a means to prepare and equip students for the duties of citizenship.	
<i>Transmission of Knowledge</i>	<i>Socialisation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn specific content through teaching (accounting metaphor: student as an empty bank account to be filled) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialised into bureaucratic norms of behaviour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn critical/analytical thinking through individual problem solving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialised with sense of 'duty' to school/society
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student as learning 'subject', teachers/staff as teaching 'agents' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialised into hierarchical system, deference to those in higher position of power, competition between students
<u>The Democratic School Perspective</u>	
The school socialises students into the norms of democratic citizenship by providing a micro-democratic society in which students participate in decision-making, debate (including around current political issues), and acculturate to values of the democratic community.	
<i>Transmission of Knowledge</i>	<i>Socialisation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn specific content and develop understanding through discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialises students into the practices of democratic decision-making, political discussion and debate, community participation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build efficacy through discussion of politics in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialised with a sense of social and individual responsibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are agents in their own learning experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialised into the values of democratic community, especially fairness and equality

The 'Modern School' Perspective

According to this perspective, the school is first and foremost a bureaucratic teaching institution where young people acquire subject knowledge and develop their cognitive capacity, analytical capability and social-organisational skills through the explicit teaching and training efforts of teachers and staff. The role of the 'modern school' is thus one of "modernising bureaucratic socialisation", whereby young people are prepared for the civic and economic duties of citizenship in a 'modern' polity "suffused with bureaucratic rationality", of which political engagement and participation are part (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 20-21; Inkeles, 1969; Kendall, 2009; Leftwich, 1996).

This perspective works from an (often) implicit understanding of democracy as a “good, fair and harmonious” political system that requires citizens to effectively communicate their interests and support the processes of government through predefined channels (Hedtke & Zimenkova, 2013: 1). Political engagement and participation is defined according to its form (voting, membership in political party etc.), as well as its purpose. From this perspective, political engagement and participation is seen as constituting of “legal activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of government personnel and the actions they take” that support and legitimise the regime (Verba, Nie & Kim, 1978: 46 cited in Bratton, 2009: 9).

The ‘modern school’ has three main functions in preparing students for engaged and participative democratic citizenship. Firstly, the school implements the formal curriculum and adopts certain pedagogical practices in order to develop students’ cognitive capacity (Campbell, 2006: 59; Nie, Junn & Stehlik-Berry, 1996: 40), analytical capability and social-organisational skills. Through the provision of formal education in a modern, bureaucratic environment, the school is thought to equip students with the knowledge and skills needed to fulfil conventional civic duties, such as registering to vote (Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980), planning and managing meetings, debating or making speeches, and writing formal letters (Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995). Secondly, the organization of the school (strict timetables, rules and procedures) inculcates a respect for and understanding of bureaucratic institutions, as well as habituating students into working within such boundaries and hierarchical administrative structures (Inkeles & Smith, 1974: 141 cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 20). Thirdly, the school may provide specific ‘civic education’ courses whereby students learn about democracy and citizenship. These three processes are assumed to have a ‘spill-over effect’ on the likelihood that students will become politically engaged and participative - whereby those who can, do (De Groof et al. 2008; Milner, 2002 & 2007).

According to the ‘modern school’ perspective then, “the educated citizen is attentive, knowledgeable, and participatory and the uneducated citizen is not” if the “educated citizen” has attended a school that has not only imparted the knowledge and skills necessary for citizenship but contributed to the development of individual modernity, including a sense civic duty (Converse, 1972; Almond & Verba, 1963; Inkeles, 1978

Harber & Mncube, 2012: 108). By “providing basic, modern bureaucratic and organisational skills, attitudes and behaviours through which more explicitly democratic values might be built”, the school is seen to lay the groundwork for political engagement and behaviour (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 109). In a democratic society, the ‘modern school’ can then develop specifically democratic qualities by teaching students about the democratic political system, their roles and responsibilities within it, and inculcating a supportive democratic disposition.

The ‘Modern School’ Perspective in South Africa

The ‘modern school’ perspective is visible in South African education policy, where a strong association between school modernity, functionality and performance is drawn, including in relation to civic outcomes. In the White Paper on education and training, there is “considerable emphasis on education as human capital as a meritocratic attempt to move away from unequal economic and social reproduction”, and the creation of “a ‘modern’ society through education by means of an efficient, professional and well managed education system” (Department of Basic Education, 2001 cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 130). However, there are three caveats that should be made clear about the applicability of the ‘modern school’ perspective to South Africa.

Firstly, the relationship between modern, bureaucratic education and education for democratic citizenship has not yet been tested in developing or post-conflict contexts, where there are high levels of dysfunction in the formal education system and deep linkages between ‘modern, bureaucratic’ education and the previous authoritarian system persist (Spaull, 2013; Harber & Mncube, 2012: 134). The history of South Africa’s education system presented in chapter 2 highlights some of the reasons that this relationship should not be taken for granted, but rather systematically tested.

Secondly, the ‘modern school’ perspective offers very little in the way of explaining unconventional forms of political engagement. In South Africa, there is a long history of unconventional political participation, especially political protest, and socio-political behaviour that seemingly falls outside of the political sphere, such as participation in labour unions. In the South African context, any exploration of school determinants of political engagement and participation should not preclude such unconventional forms.

Lastly, working from the ‘modern school’ perspective, “the impression is brought about that citizens’ *equality* in participation is ensured if the individual learners are informed of participation rights and appropriate forms of participation and they are trained to participate effectively [which] seem[s] to ignore the learner as a political individual who is confronted with participatory inequality in terms of capability, opportunity and impact” (Zimenkova & Hedtke, 2013: 232). Considering the rampant inequality in South Africa, this underlying assumption should be tempered by appropriate reflection on the effects of systemic inequality on political engagement and participation.

Mindful of the above, the ‘modern school’ perspective still provides a useful framework from which to explore school determinants of political engagement and participation among the ‘born frees’. In addition, there is reason to expect that the bureaucratic functionality of the school does play an important part in educating for democracy. One strand of research (Jansen & Blank, 2015) has linked modern bureaucratic organisation to positive formal education outcomes, even in poor or under-resources settings, while a second strand links higher levels of political knowledge (likely associated with formal education outcomes) to supportive democratic attitudes (Mattes, Denmark & Niemi, 2012). Together, these suggest a possible link between ‘modern school’ characteristics and political attitudes, and conceivably behaviour. The ‘modern school’ perspective is further developed in the research design presented in following chapter.

The ‘Democratic School’ Perspective

The ‘democratic school’ perspective sees the school as a micro-society within which students become politically engaged, thereby developing democratic political attitudes and values. From this perspective, “education [...] must be democratically organised and possess a culture of democratic relationships, and thus be a microcosm of a wider democratic state and society” (Dewey cited in Harber & Mncube, 2012: 35; Ehman, 1980; Campbell, 2005).

This perspective highlights the cultural aspects of democratic citizenship. Political engagement and participation is understood “as the voluntary action of citizens by which they articulate their political interests and aim at influencing political decisions” that, due to “its political nature, [...] holds potential for both, compliance

and insubordination” (Zimenkova & Hedtke, 2012: 229). Unlike the previous perspective, which conceptualises political engagement and participation “as if citizens’ critique and protest might be dangerous for democracy”, this perspective allows for the “essential contribution of citizens’ criticism to maintain, repair and control the developments of a democracy and a democratic state- and to endure its endemic shortcomings” (Zimenkova & Hedtke: 227). From this perspective, democratic citizenship should be extended to students in school, whereby meaningful participation, political debate and discussion, and social responsibility are imbued through a democratic school culture.

A democratic school should have a participative governance and ethos, relationships within the school should be characterised by fairness, care and a sense of community, and an open classroom climate should be cultivated, including the discussion of controversial topics related to politics (Dewey, 1916; Ehman, 1980; Freire, 1968). Ideally, these characteristics should be formalised through school documentation (vision, code of conduct, manifesto etc.), organisational structures (school governing bodies, student representative bodies, parent teacher associations etc.), and the curriculum (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 113). However, this is neither necessary nor sufficient to ensure a democratic school culture. Rather, such formalisation of ‘democracy’ at school only serves to reinforce a democratic school culture.

According to this perspective then, the ‘educated’ citizen will become politically engaged and participatory if they have experienced and become acculturated to the norms of democratic society through the school, as well as having an understanding of public issues through learning about democracy and participating in political discussion and debate at school (Campbell, 2008; Lenzi et al. 2014). Through a democratic school young people thus experience, rather than learn about, democracy and thus become accustomed to the practices of engaged and participative citizenship, both its conflicts and benefits (Stremba & Bisson, 2009: 128; Dewey, 1916).

The ‘Democratic School’ Perspective in South Africa

South African education policy explicitly emphasises the role of the school in fostering a democratic culture, and developing politically engaged and participative attitudes among students. According to Mncube (2005), policy underscores that “an effective school in South Africa is one that operates democratically in order to

promote democracy in the wider society” (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 130). As seen in chapter 2, education reform not only attempted to provide modern, quality and equal education for all South Africans, but also to democratise the education system all the way down to the classroom.

In a system already bifurcated according to academic performance, material and human resources, and basic bureaucratic functionality, this perspective provides a framework that looks beyond what we already know about the schooling landscape. Through its focus on school culture and environment, it allows for the possibility that qualities of democratic citizenship, specifically a politically engaged and participative disposition, may be cultivated in schools facing severe resource, teaching and organisational constraints. This is important as it moves away from the somewhat elitist equation of education with democratic values and behaviour, as well as recognising unconventional forms of participation (eg. protest). The ‘democratic school’ perspective thus provides a promising framework from which to further explore school determinants of political engagement and participation among the ‘born frees’.

Having presented two perspectives on the role of the school in education for democracy and considered their application in the South African context, I now turn to the research design and argument.

CHAPTER 4: ARGUMENT AND RESEARCH DESIGN

In the preceding chapters I have shown that the educational reforms instituted by the ANC government in the mid-1990s have been unevenly implemented and that the envisaged system of equal, quality and democratic public education is far from being realised. The education system is in a continual state of crisis, underlied by systemic inequality and the legacies of the past. Perhaps unsurprisingly there is little evidence that a supportive democratic political culture has developed and the continuing crisis in education gives cause for concern over the political attitudes and behaviour of South African youth. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that education and schooling can positively influence the likelihood that young South Africans will become politically engaged and participative. On the one hand, improving educational outcomes, such as cognitive capacity and political knowledge, has been shown to positively influence attitudes to democracy among the South African youth (Mattes, Denemark & Niemi, 2012). On the other, research from the broader literature has increasingly pointed to the potential role of the school, not only in influencing cognitive outcomes (Campbell, 2006), but also in the role it plays in political socialisation (Campbell, 2006 & 2008; De Groof, 2008; Langton, 1968; Lehman, 1980; Galston, 2001).

In the previous chapter, two perspectives on the role of the school in educating for democracy, specifically political engagement and participation, were framed: the ‘modern school’ and the ‘democratic school’ perspectives. Both perspectives include assumptions about the cognitive and socialising effects of the school. Building from the previous chapters, within which the context and then the theoretical basis for the research were presented, in this chapter I present the research design and argument. Starting with the dataset and analytical approach, I go on to conceptualise and operationalize the variables in the analysis, and lastly put forward the research hypotheses.

THE CAPE AREA STUDY PROJECT 2012

This research dissertation is connected to the 2012 Cape Area Study Project (CAS 2012) and uses the data collected in this study. CAS 2012 covers a representative sample of 2,518 Grade 11 students from 45 schools in the Cape Town Metropolitan Area who completed one of two self-administered questionnaires. The questions

related to our dependent variable - political engagement and participation - only appear in the second of the two surveys, completed by 1221 students. The questionnaires are made up of four sections: the first deals with general knowledge about the political system and current affairs, the second gauges students' opinions about public issues, the third asks questions about school experience, and the fourth covers demographic and socio-economic particulars. In addition, field workers collected information about each school, including on their experience with the students and staff, the material condition of the school and the level of organisational/bureaucratic efficiency.

While CAS 2012 can be considered representative of the Cape Town metropolitan area, the applicability of conclusions drawn from this analysis to South Africa as a whole will be limited. CAS 2012 does not include schools from rural areas or schools in the other large metropolitan areas of South Africa. Nonetheless, it is suited to exploring the role of the school in educating for democratic citizenship, specifically political engagement and participation. It not only captures information about the student (student level), but also about the school environment and experience (school level), providing an opportunity to systematically test the relationship between the school and the individual. Operationalized for this dataset, the variables in this analysis are thus at the school level (independent variables, N=45) and the individual level (both dependent and intervening variables, N=1,044-2,518), as will be expanded upon below.

VARIABLES

Dependent Variables: Four Components of Political Engagement and Participation

Breaking 'political engagement and participation' into its two constituent parts, political engagement is commonly understood as interest and participation in public debate and publically-spirited activity, while political participation is understood as action aimed at shaping political relations, either as an individual or group (Galston, 2001; Campbell, 2006). Considering the profile of political engagement and participation in South Africa, where conventional forms of participation (voting) are falling and unconventional forms (service delivery strikes and protest) are not only common but increasing, it seems prudent to further differentiate between these components. Accordingly, I further break political participation into three

components. The first is conventional/legal political action, the second is unconventional/illegal political action, the third is voting in elections. I treat voting as a separate and unique from conventional/legal action because research has demonstrated “that for analytical purposes, voting should be analysed on its own” as “voting is fundamentally different from other acts” (Campbell, 2006: 30; Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995: 23-24). All together, I use four dependent variable components to explore school determinants of political engagement and participation among South African ‘born free’ generation, as captured in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Four Components of a Politically Engaged and Participative Disposition

Concept	Operationalization*
Legal Political Participation <i>Political participation through conventional and legal means.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of five items, divided by 5.</i> (1) Bx15c. Likelihood of working for pol. party election campaign (2) Bx15d. Likelihood of contacting elected official (3) Bx15e. Likelihood of raising awareness of important issues (4) Bx15f. Likelihood of writing to editor or calling to radio about public issue (5) Bx15g. Likelihood of participating in peaceful protest
Illegal Political Participation <i>Political participation through unconventional and illegal means.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of two items, divided by 2.</i> (1) Bx15h. Likelihood of blocking traffic as protest (2) Bx15i. Likelihood of occupying public buildings in protest
Voting <i>Voting in elections.</i>	<i>Single Item.</i> (1) Bx15b. Likelihood of voting in election.
Political Engagement <i>Interest in public affairs.</i>	<i>Single Item.</i> (1) B10. Interest in public affairs.

As most students in the CAS 2012 sample are minors (under the age of 18), many have not yet had the opportunity to participate in certain ways (such as voting) or have had limited ability to participate (due to resource constraints associated with being a legal minor/young). As such, it is their political engagement and *disposition* towards each of the political participation components that I used in forming the dependent variable components in this analysis. This has the added benefit of allowing us to explore the influence of the school on ‘born frees’ attitudes to political

* Testing for validity and reliability, I applied a maximum likelihood extraction and direct oblimin rotation factor analysis for each of the variable constructs and indices below, guaranteeing that if a factor solution can be found, it will also be found via all other methods. However, I use simple average and additive index scores in the final analysis. Since the actual factor weightings of individual items may vary across countries and social groups, it is safest to assume that all items contribute to each index equally. Unless otherwise noted, all descriptive and test statistics are calculated omitting missing data and either excluding ‘don’t know’ answers, or recoding them to theoretically defensible positions on the response scale.

citizenship which, due to the unequal institutional and structural characteristics of the political system, may not reflect in data on actual behaviour (eg. Voting). However, stated intention/ positive disposition toward political participation in adolescence has been found to correlate highly with actual participation in adulthood, which informs my interpretation of the results (Campbell, 2006).

Independent Variables: The ‘Modern School’ Model

The ‘modern school’ perspective advances those school characteristics associated with modern and formal schooling to be of primary importance in the development of positive dispositions toward political engagement and participation. At the school level, these are operationalized as: formal/academic performance (matric pass rate 2013), political knowledge test performance (mean score for school), and bureaucratic efficiency of the school (CAS 2012 field worker estimation). The assumption is that students that attend schools that perform better along these indicators will be more likely to be politically engaged and positively predisposed to political participation because they will have acquired knowledge, skills, bureaucratic know-how and familiarity with bureaucratic structures and relationships. In addition, this model assumes that students at better performing or more ‘modern’ schools will also have higher levels of individual political knowledge and demand democracy more than those at worse performing schools, having learnt about democracy at school. The independent variables of the ‘modern school’ model are captured below in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: The 'Modern School' Model

<i>School Level Independent Variables</i>	
<i>Variables</i>	<i>Operationalization*</i>
School Academic Performance <i>The school's academic performance, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>Index: School mean Matric Score, 0-100 per cent.</i> (1) Mean matric pass rate 2013
School Political Knowledge <i>The school's academic performance, specifically with regards to political content, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>School mean of additive scale of student political knowledge test score, nine items (see student political knowledge).</i> (1) testScore. Total correct answers in A1 to A9
School Bureaucratic Efficiency <i>The school's bureaucratic efficiency, with regards to timetables, organisation and management, at the school level.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of three items, divided by 3.</i> (1) S.22 School secretary was overburdened/disorganised (2) S.24 Students/classes were under control (3) S.25 Classes started on time and students were timeous
<i>Student Level Intervening Variables</i>	
Student Political Knowledge <i>Political Knowledge test score, number correct of nine questions, at the student level.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of the following nine items.</i> (1) A1correct: Identify example of discrimination (2) A2correct: Purpose of multi-party democracy (3) A3correct: Constitutional Court (4) A4correct: Constitution Bill of Rights (5) A5correct: Party majority in national legislature (6) A6correct: Party majority in provincial legislature (7) A7correct: Meaning of democracy (8) A8correct: Apartheid ruling party (9) A9correct: Sharpeville Massacre
Student Understanding of Democracy <i>Understanding democracy as a process, as apposed to instrumentally, at the student level.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of six items, divided by 6.</i> (1) B8a. Majority Rule (2) B8b. Freedom of Expression (3) B8c. Regular Elections (4) B8d. Two+ Parties Competing (5) B8e. Limits on Govt Power (6) B8f. Protection of Minorities
Student Demand for Democracy <i>Support for and preference of democracy over any other political regime, at the student level.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of six items, divided by 6.</i> (1) B5. Importance of Democracy (2) B6. Preference for Democracy (3) B7a. Reject One-Party Rule (4) B7b. Reject One-Man Rule (5) B7c. Reject Military Rule (6) B7d. Reject Apartheid

Independent Variables: The ‘Democratic School’ Model

The ‘democratic school’ perspective advances those school characteristics associated with a democratic school culture to be of primary importance in the development of positive dispositions toward political engagement and participation. At the school level, these are made up of: a participative ethos, democratic decision-making, a supportive and fair school environment, open classroom climate, and frequent political discussion, including students raising politics in class. The assumption is that students that attend schools that are more democratic, as indicated by these characteristics, will more likely be politically engaged and positively predisposed to political participation because they will have been socialised into the norms of participation, discussion in a democratic socio-political community, and have an understanding of politics and democratic citizenship built from first hand experience. In addition, this model assumes that students at more ‘democratic’ schools will also have a greater sense of internal efficacy than those at worse performing schools, having experienced democracy at school, including political participation and discussion. The independent variables of the ‘democratic school’ model are captured below in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: The ‘Democratic School’ Model

<i>School Level Independent Variables</i>	
Variables	Operationalization*
School Participative Ethos <i>Participation in school organisations and decision-making bodies, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>School mean of additive scale of scale of seven items, divided by 7.</i> (1) C7a. Involved in: Represented Council of Learners (2) C7b. Involved in: School Governing Body (3) C7c. Involved in: Other school committee (4) C7d. Involved in: A sports team (5) C7e. Involved in: School club or committee (6) C7f. Involved in: A religious group (7) C7g. Involved in: Arts project, club or society
School Democratic Decision-Making <i>Students feel that they play a decision-making role at school, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>School mean of single item.</i> (1) C2e. In school, students play a decision-making role
School Environment <i>Supportive and fair relationships between students, and students and staff, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>Index: School mean of additive scale of four items, divided by 4.</i> (1) C2a. In school, most students care for all (2) C2b. In school, teachers discourage making fun of others (3) C2c. In school, most teachers listen (4) C2d. In school, teachers give students a fair chance
School Classroom Climate <i>Open discussion, room for disagreement, and student participation is encouraged in class, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>Index: School mean of additive scale of three items, divided by 3.</i> (1) C1a. Teachers encourage students to make up own minds (2) C1b. Students can respectfully disagree with teachers (3) C1c. Teachers present several sides of issue
School Frequency of Political Discussion <i>Frequency with which current events and politics are discussed in class, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>Index: School mean of additive scale of four items, divided by 4.</i> (1) C5a. Life Orientation Class (2) C5b. History/Geography Class (3) C5c. Business/Economics Class (4) C5d. Other Classes
School Students Raise Politics <i>Frequency with which students raise politics during class, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>School mean of single item.</i> (1) C1d. Students bring up current pol. events
<i>Student Level Intervening Variable</i>	
Student Internal Efficacy <i>Confidence in personal understanding of political content and the ability to contribute meaningfully on political issues, at the student level.</i>	<i>Construct: Additive construct of two items, divided by 2.</i> (1) B11a. Able to understand most political issues (2) B11b. Good at explaining political issues

Background Variables: South African Schools and Students

Controlling for background variables in this analysis is challenging due to the continuing correlation between race, class, educational background, and schools in South Africa. Nonetheless, the following school level and student level background variables are considered in the descriptive and final analysis. In this way, the legacies of apartheid, the current state of the schooling landscape, and students' demographic backgrounds are taken into account. The background variables are captured below in Table 4.4 and Table 4.5.

Table 4.4: School Background

<i>School Level</i>	
Variables	Operationalization*
School Previous Administration <i>Apartheid administrative department according to race.</i>	<i>Single Item, categorical.</i>
	Sources from WCED- SchoolbyPrevAdmin: 1. CED – Cape Education Department, previously white 2. IND – Independent school, no previous race classification 3. HOR – House of Representatives, previously coloured 4. DET – Department of Education and Training, previously black 5. WCED –Western Cape Education Department, post-1994 (mainly poorer schools in black/coloured communities)
School Socio-Economic Status <i>National Norms and Standards for School Funding (NNSSF) quintile.</i>	<i>Single Item, categorical.</i>
	Sourced from WCED (1) SQuintile (1-5)
School Racial Homogeneity <i>Degree of racial homogeneity in the school.</i>	<i>Index: Herfindahl score, rating the likelihood that a student will be of the same race as the majority race of the school's sample.</i>
	Calculated by squaring the share of each race in the school and summing the resulting numbers. (1) HerfindahlIndex (0-100)

Table 4.5: Student Background

<i>Student Level Intervening Variable</i>	
Student Race <i>Student's race, self identified.</i>	<i>Dummy variable constructed for white, african and coloured.</i> (1) d7_african (0=no, 1=yes) (2) d7_coloured (0=no, 1=yes) (3) d7_white (0=no, 1=yes)
Student Economic Insecurity <i>Supportive and fair relationships between students, and students and staff, at the aggregate school level.</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of the following 3 items, divided by 3.</i> (1) D12d. Worried that your family does not have enough money (2) D12e. Worried that someone in your family will suffer a serious illness (3) D12f. Gone without electricity
Student Socio-Economic Status <i>Household Assets</i>	<i>Index: Additive scale of the following 14 items.</i> (1) D13a. Tv set (2) D13b. Car, bakkie or passenger vehicle (3) D13c. M-net/DStv subscription (4) D13d. Radio/Hi-Fi music centre (5) D13e. Computer (5) D13d. Dish washing machine (6) D13g. Washing machine (7) D13h. Electric stove (8) D13i. Fridge/Freezer (9) D13j. Home security service (10) D13k. Tap water (11) D13l. Hot running water (12) D13m. Flush toilet (13) D14a. Personal mobile phone

ARGUMENT

Two types of questions guide this research. The first is descriptive, concerned with the political engagement and participation profile of the ‘born frees’ and features of the South African schooling landscape. The answers to these exploratory and descriptive questions then provide the basis for the primary research question, which is concerned with the way in which the school influences ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and dispositions towards political participation. In this section I present a series of hypotheses about the dependent variable (political engagement and participation) and the context (the South African schooling landscape), and then move onto the key research hypotheses.

Descriptive Hypotheses

‘Born Free’ Political Engagement and Disposition Toward Political Participation

Hypothesis 1: ‘Born Frees’ are likely to be moderately engaged in politics and exhibit moderately positive dispositions toward political participation, although they will be more predisposed to legal participation, including voting, than illegal participation.

Working from longitudinal data spanning the past twenty years -the first two decades of democracy in South Africa- there appears to be little change or generational differentiation in indicators of engaged and participative democratic political citizenship (Mattes, 2011; Mattes & Richmond, 2015). South African youth³ display moderate levels of political engagement, with between 50 and 60 per cent reporting being somewhat or very interested in politics over the time period (Mattes & Richmond, 2015: 5). With regards to political participation, South African youth exhibit moderate to weak dispositions toward political participation through conventional means, specifically voting (Mattes & Richmond, 2015). However, this is in line with a global pattern of low youth participation, which likely is reflective of some combination of the initial barriers to participation (such as pre-registration for voting), shifting norms around political participation resulting from the proliferation of mobile and computer technology, and increasing scepticism towards conventional politics among the youth (Norris, 2002).

In the first ‘born free’ national election in 2014, only a third of the two million ‘born frees’ eligible to vote registered, with a lower percentage showing up at the polls (Coetzee, 2014; Mattes & Richmond, 2015). Whereas ‘born frees’ eligible to vote made up only 10 per cent of the voting age population in 2014, at the next national elections in 2019 they will account for approximately a third of the voting age population. Understanding the determinants and barriers to ‘born frees’ voting, and political engagement and participation in general, will thus be of increasing relevance. In a descriptive analysis of the dependent variable, I explore the four components of politically engaged and participative citizenship in order to test hypothesis 1.

³ Age 18-25.

The South African Schooling Landscape

Hypothesis 2: The South African schooling landscape is likely to reflect the divides of the past in terms of academic performance, racial distribution and socio-economic status.

Hypothesis 3: Modern School Characteristics- South African schools that are well resourced and previously advantaged will have a high level of academic achievement and bureaucratic efficiency.

Hypothesis 4: Democratic School Characteristics- South African schools are likely to exhibit a mix of democratic characteristics, depending on the context and history of the school. Wealthier schools that are better able to implement the curriculum, including pedagogical practices, and enjoy significant material and human resources will display higher levels of participation and have more open classroom climates. Meanwhile, poorer schools will have more political discussion due to the politicised role of the school in poorer communities during apartheid.

The South African education system is bifurcated in terms of educational outcomes and resources, perpetuating the divides instituted by apartheid regime (Jansen & Taylor, 2003; Fiske & Ladd, 2004; van der Berg, 2007; Fleish, 2008; Spaull, 2013 & 2015). As discussed in Chapter 2, as part of the larger segregationist policies of Apartheid, South African schools were segregated according to race and fell under the jurisdiction of different education departments as a result. This had implications for the organisation and management of, and the funding and resources available to, different departments and their schools. This system left the majority of schools (serving African and coloured students) under-resourced, overcrowded and underperforming.

In the CAS 2012 sample, public schools that existed under apartheid fell under one of the following previous administrative departments: Cape Education Department (CED- formerly white), House of Representatives (HOR- formerly coloured), and Department of Education and Training (DET- formerly African). In addition, the sample includes independent schools (IND- private schools) and Western Cape Education Department schools (post-1994, mainly poorer schools in African/coloured communities). In a descriptive analysis of the South African schooling landscape, I

group schools according to their (previous/current) administration in order to test hypothesis 2, 3 and 4.

Primary Research Hypotheses: The Role of the School in Educating for Political Engagement and Participation

Modern School Hypothesis

Hypothesis 5: Modern school characteristics will positively influence ‘born free’ students’ interest in politics and dispositions toward conventional participation by familiarising them with modern, bureaucratic institutional norms and providing each with the knowledge, understanding and internal efficacy necessary to participate.

According to the ‘modern school’ perspective, a modern school will exhibit a high level of bureaucratic efficiency, a high overall level of academic achievement, and a high overall level of political knowledge (transmitted through formal education). With regards to bureaucratic efficiency and academic performance, extant literature in South Africa already finds a link between bureaucratic efficiency and academic performance (Jansen & Blank, 2015). In *How to Fix South African Schools: Lessons from Schools that Work*, Jansen identifies ten strategies to ‘turn around’ dysfunctional schools to make them ‘work’. These include: structure, routine, discipline, high expectation and leadership from the principle (Jansen & Blank, 2015). From this perspective, such ‘modern school’ characteristics are expected to increase students’ political knowledge, understanding of democracy, and demand for democracy, as well as familiarising them with modern, bureaucratic institutional norms.

However, whether or not ‘schools that work’ in achieving academic outcomes also ‘work’ in developing interest in politics and positive dispositions toward political participation among students is uncertain. It is also possible that the ‘authoritarian’ type organisation, the tendency to focus on individual success, and a ‘depoliticised’ educational environment could limit real engagement and participation, with the exception of the most conventional forms of participation, such as voting. This is not to say that there is a trade-off between ‘modern’ and ‘democratic’ characteristics in schools, but rather – to reiterate Finkel and Enrst (2006)– that “the primary factors that promote successful learning in one area of civic education, the imparting of basic factual political knowledge, are not likely to be the same factors that promote successful learning in other, more value-based and attitudinal realms” (67).

Democratic School Hypothesis

Hypothesis 6: Democratic school characteristics will positively influence ‘born free’ students’ interest in politics and dispositions toward political participation by socialising them through the culture and practices of democratic citizenship within the micro-society of the school. These include participation in decision-making and school groups, political discussion and debate, fair and caring school community relationships, and an open classroom climate. In addition, students who participate in and experience democracy at school will have a developed sense of internal efficacy.

According to the ‘democratic school’ perspective, a democratic school will exhibit: an ethos of participation, including students’ participation in decision-making at school and school organisations; an environment that encourages participation, which is thought to include caring and fair relationships between students, and students and staff; an open classroom climate, which allows for discussion, disagreement and debate; and, lastly, political discussion at school.

While each of these characteristics may influence dispositions toward political engagement and participation, this perspective allows for the effect to be either positive or negative depending on the nature of a student’s ‘experience’. For example, if participation in the school’s decision-making structures exposes students to unfair/unequal power dynamics, this may have a negative effect on dispositions toward political engagement and participation. This is especially relevant in the South African setting, where there has been a top-down approach to ‘democratising’ schools, which means that schools may exhibit democratic structures without having a democratic culture (Harber & Mncube, 2012: 156). The ‘democratic school’ model thus demands a contextually informed and flexible approach to testing and interpreting results. Nonetheless, democratic characteristics are generally expected to have a positive effect on students’ interest in politics and disposition toward political participation.

Intervening and Background Variables

Hypotheses 7: Students who have higher levels of political knowledge, a strong preference for democracy (demand democracy), understand democracy as a process and/or a developed sense of internal efficacy are more likely to be politically engaged and positively disposed toward political participation.

The primary research hypotheses are based on the assumption that the school influences students' dispositions toward political engagement and participation directly, as well as indirectly through influencing certain individual level attributes that may also shape students' dispositions. While the primary focus falls on school level independent variables, I thus also include the following student level intervening variables: political knowledge, political understanding, demand for democracy and internal efficacy.

Hypothesis 8a: Students from higher socio-economic status backgrounds and/or who are white are likely to be more politically engaged and positively disposed toward political participation because they have greater access to information, political and economic networks, and resources, including time.

Hypothesis 8b: Students from lower socio-economic status backgrounds and/or who are non-white (African or coloured) are more likely to be politically engaged and positively disposed toward political participation because they are more directly affected by the short-comings of government.

In addition to these intervening variables, I include background variables on the students' race and socio-economic background, testing hypothesis 8a and 8b.

Having laid out the research design and argument, I now go on to present the results in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

In this chapter, I present and discuss the research results. In the first section I consider the descriptive results, surveying the Cape Town ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and dispositions toward political participation, and then exploring the school landscape with regards to socio-economic background, racial homogeneity, and the school characteristics of the ‘modern school’ and ‘democratic school’ models. I then go on to present the primary research results in the second section, providing a description of the results for each dependent variable: disposition toward legal participation, disposition toward illegal participation, voting and political engagement. Lastly, I discuss the overall findings in the third section, considering the school’s impact on ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and dispositions toward political participation.

DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH RESULTS

‘Born Free’ Political Engagement and Disposition Toward Political Participation

Looking at political engagement and dispositions toward political participation among the ‘born free’ student CAS 2012 respondents, hypothesis 1 is largely confirmed. The results presented in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 indicate that Cape Town ‘born free’ school students are moderately predisposed to legal participation, strongly predisposed to voting, and somewhat engaged in politics. They are more positively disposed toward less conventional yet social forms of participation (joining others in raising awareness of a public issue, in peaceful protest or using media as a platform), than to conventional participation in election campaigns. When it comes to voting, the most conventional form of political participation, they are relatively committed. Half of respondents say that they will definitely vote, and an additional third say that they will probably vote. Almost two-thirds of respondents are actively interested in politics. In contrast, most respondents are unlikely to participate in illegal activity, with two-fifths saying that they definitely will not and a remaining third saying that it would be unlikely for them to participate in illegal political activity.

Table 5.1 Dependent Variables Component Questions - Descriptives

Disposition Towards Participation				
<i>Question: Listed below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things?</i>				
<i>0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this</i>	0	1	2	3
Work for a party during an election campaign.	16%	26%	32%	17%
<i>n</i>	1339			
Contact an elected official during an election campaign.	14%	30%	36%	19%
<i>n</i>	1348			
Join with others to raise awareness of an important issue.	6%	18%	42%	34%
<i>n</i>	1345			
Write letter to editor/call in to radio show about public issue.	15%	28%	35%	22%
<i>n</i>	1344			
Participate in a peaceful protest march or rally.	15%	27%	34%	24%
<i>n</i>	1343			
Block traffic as a form of protest.	40%	37%	17%	7%
<i>n</i>	1351			
Occupy public buildings as a form of protest	40%	34%	19%	8%
<i>n</i>	1358			
Vote in an election	4%	7%	35%	53%
<i>n</i>	1338			
Political Engagement				
<i>Question: How interested are you in public affairs (politics and government)?</i>				
<i>0=Not at all interested, 1=Not very interested, 2=Somewhat interested, 3= Very interested</i>	0	1	2	3
Response	15%	28%	38%	19%
<i>n</i>	2512			

In Table 5.2 I explore the four dependent variables. Legal participation and political engagement have a similar distribution, with students moderately more likely to be positively disposed to participation in legal political activity and to be interested in politics (Skewness -0.22 and -0.18, respectively), although the distribution is relatively even (Kurtosis -0.39 and -0.89, respectively). Illegal participation is similar in that it is relatively even (Kurtosis -0.43), but skewed positively - most students are unlikely to be positively disposed to participation in illegal political activity

(Skewness 0.65). Meanwhile, voting is strongly negatively skewed (-1.27), as the majority of students are likely to vote (mode and median 3), with the exception of a few outliers (11.6% of the sample population). Working from the survey question responses in Table 5.1 to the four constructed components of political engagement and participation in Table 5.2, the dependent variable components are valid at face value.

Table 5.2 Independent Variable Components - Descriptives

	Legal Participation	Illegal Participation	Voting	Political Engagement
Mean	1.68	.91	2.37	1.61
Median	1.80	1.00	3.00	2.00
Mode	1.40	.00	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation	.70	.85	.79	.95
Skewness	-.22	.65	-1.27	-.18
Kurtosis	-.39	-.43	1.21	-.89 ⁴
<i>n</i>	1143	1148	1174	2447
*Scale 0-3, from less to more likely for disposition towards participation variables, and from less to more interested for political engagement.				

Table 5.3 Dependent Variable Components Correlation

	Legal Participation	Illegal Participation	Voting	Interest in Politics
Legal Participation (<i>n</i>)	1			
Illegal Participation (<i>n</i>)	.422** (1123)	1		
Voting (<i>n</i>)	.332** (1140)	.043 (1145)	1	
Interest in Politics (<i>n</i>)	.426** (1130)	.194** (1135)	.275* (1159)	1
** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)				

Turning to the relationships among these four components, in Table 5.3 I present the results of a bivariate correlation. Of particular interest is the positive correlation between dispositions toward legal and illegal participation. This is unexpected as legal and illegal forms of participation are traditionally treated as “analytically distinct types of political behaviour”, both in practice and motivation (Muller, 1982: 1 cited in Lamprianou, 2013: 24). However, the fact that there is no correlation between

⁴ With Regards to Engaged and Participative Disposition: Each of the scores range from 0 (I definitely will not do this or I am not at all interested), through 1 and 2 (I would probably/not do this or I am no very/somewhat interested), to 3 (I certainly would do this or I am very interested).

dispositions toward voting and illegal participation does hint that there are still important distinctions between these forms of political activity. Overall, these results support the operationalization of the broader dependent variable - 'engaged and participative disposition towards politics' - as being made up of these four specific, interrelated components.

The crisis in education and enduring inequality across the system has contributed to the predominance of two narratives, across arenas of popular political discourse, about the political engagement and participation profile of the 'born frees'. The first narrative treats the 'born frees', especially those who are uneducated and unemployed, as a 'ticking time bomb'. According to this narrative, the 'born frees' are likely to be predisposed to destructive and potentially violent political behaviour which, with the spark of a populist movement or some inevitable catalysing political or economic event, will explode. This narrative also often exhibits links to the apartheid fear mongering narrative of the 'swart gevaar' (black danger), an insidious justification of racial segregation that cultivated a fear among the minority white population of the majority African population by framing them as uncivilised, uneducated, tribal and violent. The second narrative frames the youth as politically apathetic and disengaged, unlikely to defend or strengthen democracy – a narrative built around the low levels of youth political participation and engagement over the past 20 years. These narratives endure despite “systematic evidence to the contrary”, and it is truly “surprising how rarely important empirical findings and trends on political issues inform political discourse” in South Africa (Mattes & Richmond, 2015: 1).

The results presented here provide a profile of Cape Town 'born free' students political engagement and disposition towards political participation that is reassuring, yet still concerning. On the one hand, they contradict the pervasive 'ticking time bomb'⁵ narrative that represents 'born frees' as a generation set to explode into mass violent, illegal and destructive political behaviour (Mattes & Richmond, 2015; The Times, 2016; Friedman, 2014). On the other hand, that levels of commitment to legal forms of participation and interest in politics are at best 'moderate' indicates that this

5

generation has yet to fully embrace the culture of engaged and participative democratic citizenship.

The South African Schooling Landscape

Academic Performance, Socio-Economic Status and Racial Distribution

Grouping schools into the three pre-1994 administrative departments (CED, DET and HOR), independent, and post-1994 (WCED) categories, and comparing mean scores for academic performance, racial homogeneity and socio-economic status across these groups, the “exclusive equity” of the South African schooling system, which I discussed in chapter 2, is confirmed (Fiske & Ladd, 2004).

Formerly CED schools (previously white and most advantaged by the apartheid system) have a mean Matric pass rate of 98.8% and mostly fall into the highest socio-economic status group, quintile 5. Meanwhile, formerly DET schools (previously African and most disadvantaged by the apartheid system) have a mean Matric pass rate of 71.35% and mostly fall into the lowest socio-economic status group in this dataset, quintile 2. Formerly HOR schools (previously coloured) fall somewhere between these two groups and vary more, with an average Matric pass rate of 82.1% and most placing in quintile 4. The CAS 2012 sample also includes new (post-1994) WCED schools and independent schools (which were either established post-1994 or were run privately without state funding under apartheid). Post-1994 WCED schools have a mean Matric pass rate of 78.6%, with most falling into quintile 3. In this dataset, the Independent schools resemble the formerly CED schools most, with a mean Matric pass rate of 94.3% and all schools falling into the highest socio-economic status group, quintile 5.

Table 5.4 School Background Variables: Grouped Previous/Current Administration

	CED	IND	HOR	DET	WCED
Matric Pass Rate	98.80%	94.30%	82.10%	71.35%	78.60%
SES (Quintile)	4.9	5	4.4	2.5	3.2
Racial Homogeneity ¹	55.9	76.3	83.7	94.0	83.4
Race: Black	12.40%	49.60%	24.90%	97.10%	75.30%
Race: Coloured	54.00%	18.30%	74.30%	2.20%	24.00%
Race: White	30.70%	31.00%	0.40%	0.70%	0.70%
Race: Other	2.90%	1.10%	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%

From these results, it is clear that there has been little change in the poorest schools, which continue to underperform and serve coloured and African students almost exclusively. There has been some positive change in CED schools in terms of increasing racial heterogeneity. However, this is primarily a result of the socio-economic mobility of a small portion of the African and coloured population (Chrisholm, 2004). The results presented in Table 5.4 support hypothesis 2, as academic performance, socio-economic status and racial homogeneity at South African schools continue to reflect the divides of the past, with the exception of high racial diversity at wealthier schools.

South African Schools: Modern and Democratic?

In order to get a sense of the South African schooling landscape beyond the already well-traversed intersection of academic performance, socio-economic status and race, I now look to characteristics of the CAS 2012 sample of schools in terms of the ‘modern school’ and ‘democratic school’ models. These results are presented in Table 5.5.

In this table, the mean score for each school characteristic is the average score for all students in each group. For example, the score of 5.27 for School Political Knowledge is the mean Student Political Knowledge test score of all 622 students attending CED schools. In addition to the results presented in table 5.5, I ran a one-way ANOVA with a post-hoc LSD test to compare means. These results are presented in Annex B. This test confirmed that, for the most part, formerly CED, HOR, DET, and independent and WCED schools are significantly different from each other across most school level variables (as experienced by students and/or recorded by CAS 2012 field workers).

Table 5.5 School Characteristics: Grouped Previous/Current Administration

	Sample Mean	CED	IND	HOR	DET	WCED
School Academic Performance	85.7%	98.80%	94.30%	82.10%	71.35%	78.60%
School Political Knowledge (Scale 0-9)	4.56	5.27	5.46	4.21	4.02	4.00
School Bureaucratic Efficiency (Scale 0-3)	2.68	2.82	2.24	2.78	2.37	2.85
School Participative Ethos (Scale 0-3)	1.79	1.70	1.85	1.67	1.92	2.08
School Democratic Decision-Making (Scale 0-3)	2.53	2.46	2.32	2.53	2.68	2.65
School Environment (Scale 0-3)	2.53	2.38	2.61	2.44	2.71	2.80
School Classroom Climate (Scale 0-3)	2.33	2.41	2.35	2.34	2.24	2.22
School Frequency of Political Discussion (Scale 0-3)	1.33	1.23	1.44	1.37	1.12	1.58
School Students Raise Politics (Scale 0-3)	1.82	1.82	2.02	1.8	1.72	1.86
Schools <i>n</i>	45	11	6	17	6	5
Students <i>n</i>	2512	622	277	917	377	319

Modern School Characteristics

With regard to ‘modern school’ characteristics, the Cape Town ‘born free’ students’ responses to CAS 2012 are more or less as expected. On average, students in previously advantaged schools continue to outperform students in previously disadvantaged schools academically. This appears to be mirrored in the average school level political knowledge, indicating that successful transmission of political knowledge is related to the overall ability of the school to perform academically. However, the hypothesised link between former/current administration and bureaucratic efficiency finds little support. CED, HOR and WCED schools have similar levels of bureaucratic efficiency, as measured by the CAS 2012 field worker. This indicates that bureaucratic efficiency varies from school to school, and has less to do with historical and current resource dis/advantages than hypothesised. This resonates with the argument that ‘turning around dysfunctional schools’ does not necessarily require previous advantage or financial resources, but rather the implementation of structure, routine, and discipline, as well as high expectations and leadership from the principle (see: Jansen & Blank, 2015). The relationship between

bureaucratic efficiency and academic performance will be explored further in the next section. Overall, hypothesis 3 finds some support, as South African schools that are well resourced do have a higher level of academic performance (including the transmission of political knowledge), however they do not have a higher level of bureaucratic efficiency.

Democratic School Characteristics

With regards to democratic school characteristics, the Cape Town ‘born free’ students’ response to the CAS 2012 survey is varied. South African schools exhibit a mix of democratic characteristics, somewhat reflective of the context and history of the school, however, not quite as hypothesised.

Previously advantaged and/or wealthy schools are not experienced as highly participative, democratic or fair and caring, at least not in the eyes of their students, while previously disadvantaged and/or poorer schools are. Despite multiple resource advantages, including libraries, computer centres, sports fields, a larger staff, and financial support from home, students at wealthier/previously-advantaged schools participate in fewer school organisations and student governance groups. Instead, it is the students at DET and WCED schools (the poorest in the sample) who report the highest levels of participation in extracurricular activities. This indicates a more participative ethos at these schools. On average, students at DET and WCED schools also feel that they play a greater decision-making role at school when compared with responses from their peers at CED and HOR schools. Students at DET and WCED schools also experience the school environment as more fair and caring than those at CED and HOR schools, which may explain or be explained by the levels of participation and the sense that decision-making is democratic. The relationship between these will be explored further in the following section.

This pattern does not extend to the experience of classroom climate however, which is experienced as more open by students at CED, independent and HOR schools, than those at DET and WCED schools. This seems contrary to the above, however is not necessarily so. In poorer and/or rural settings, more traditional, teacher-centred and even rote learning is still common (Harber & Mncube, 2012; Hoadley, 2010; Spaul, 2013, Fleisch, 2008). In such schools, participative, caring, and fair characteristics may be evident, even where the classroom climate is more traditional and the practice

of discussion, disagreement and debate is uncommon in pedagogical practice. In contrast, and as hypothesised, schools that are likely to be better equipped to implement the more demanding pedagogical practices associated with an open classroom climate, do.

Looking at political discussion, no clear picture around the frequency of political discussion in different school groups emerges.

Together, these results support hypothesis 4, as South African schools do exhibit a mix of democratic characteristics, which appear to be linked to the context and history of the school. However, specific hypotheses about the relationship between resources and context, and democratic school characteristics do not find support.

PRIMARY RESEARCH RESULTS

Together, the descriptive results largely confirm that the first generation ‘born citizens’ of the South African democracy have yet to fully take up the dispositions and attitudes associated with engaged and participative democratic citizenship. Given that ‘born free’ students are only moderately politically engaged and participative in their dispositions, and given the persistence of systemic inequality between schools and the steep challenges posed by the education crisis, what role does the school play in educating for democracy, specifically political engagement and participation?

In this section, the primary research hypotheses advanced in the previous chapter are tested through a hierarchical linear regression, which I run on each of the four dependent variable components. This is done through five progressive regression models. All variables were standardised before the regression was run. In addition, I introduced race into each regression as a dummy variable (1=yes, 0=no), first ‘white’, then ‘coloured’, and then ‘african/black’, reporting results only where statistically significant.

Because the primary focus of this dissertation is on the school’s influence on ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and disposition towards various forms of participation, the first three models test the impact of school characteristics. I begin with background characteristics because these are the most systematically recorded and researched – and it is useful to reflect on the relationship between these characteristics and the dependent variables. However, this dissertation is driven to take the analysis of the school’s influence on student’s attitudes toward political

engagement and participation further by investigating the influence of other more ‘cultural’ characteristics. In the second and third model, these are introduced through the ‘modern school’ and ‘democratic school’ models – both developed earlier in the dissertation. Together, these three models capture the effect of the school on students’ attitudes to political engagement and participation. In order to deepen the analysis, and provide links to extant research on individual-level characteristics that correlate with political attitudes and values, in the fourth model I add student level intervening variables. In the fifth model, the individual student’s socio-economic background characteristics are accounted for. Lastly, the effect of the student’s race is considered. Ordering the models in this way allows for a more nuanced analysis of the general effects of selected school characteristics on students’ dispositions toward political engagement and participation, as well as more pointed analysis of the influence of the selected school characteristics on students from different socio-economic and racial backgrounds. In addition, through the fourth model, the regression results provide some insight into the ways in which certain school characteristics affect students political attitudes through, for example increasing their knowledge or sense of internal efficacy.

In this section, the results are organised around the four dependent variable components as presented in table 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10. The discussion which follows is then structured around the school characteristics and educational factors (independent variables) hypothesised to influence ‘born frees’ political engagement and disposition toward political participation.

Students’ Disposition Toward Legal Participation

A healthy and sustainable democracy rests on more than voting in elections. Other forms of legal participation and engagement are integral to the development and maintenance of a democratic political culture. In CAS 2012, students are asked whether or not they would participate in the following legal forms of political participation and engagement: working for a political party in an election, contacting elected officials, raising awareness of important public issues, writing to editor or calling in to radio about public issue, and participating in a peaceful protest. Together, these make up the dependent variable component: disposition toward legal participation. Looking at the results presented in table 5.6, the school seems to have a

definite impact on the likelihood that students will be positively disposed toward legal political participation.

Working from model 1 through to model 5, school characteristics that have a direct impact on the likelihood that students will participate through legal channels include: the degree to which the school environment is characterised by fair and caring relationships (Beta .127) and the frequency of political discussion (Beta .157). The magnitude of this effect and the degree of significance makes this an important finding, especially because the effect remains even after controlling for students' background.

Table 5.6 Regression Results: Dependent Variable Legal Participation

		Model 1 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 2 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 3 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 4 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 5 (Beta, Sig.)	Race White	Race Black
School Level	School Background							
	Socio-Economic Status	-.226 .000	-.174 .000	-.050 .349	-.054 .285	.010 .854	.009 .862	.012 .813
	Racial Homogeneity	.084 .020	.051 .192	.036 .344	.025 .487	.013 .715	.018 .607	.011 .756
	Modern School Model							
	Academic Performance		-.073 .110	-.021 .642	-.022 .615	-.024 .584	-.013 .756	-.049 .249
	Political Knowledge		-.075 .093	-.119 .040	-.151 .009	-.091 .115	-.066 .260	-.065 .255
	Bureaucratic Efficiency		.052 .144	.083 .022	.061 .076	.048 .155	.053 .112	.078 .021
	Democratic School Model							
	Participative Ethos			.026 .561	.020 .639	.010 .814	.031 .461	-.017 .693
	Decision Making			-.017 .645	-.003 .924	-.023 .500	-.028 .419	-.035 .300
	School Environment			.152 .001	.150 .000	.127 .002	.114 .005	-.055 .201
	Classroom Climate			-.026 .598	-.017 .715	-.018 .690	-.018 .689	-.004 .936
	Freq. Political Discussion			.256 .000	.172 .000	.157 .000	.153 .000	.169 .000
	Students Raise Politics			.009 .827	.022 .580	.006 .881	.008 .843	-.010 .805
Student Level	Student Intervening Variables							
	Political Knowledge				-.049 .211	-.051 .186	-.045 .240	-.061 .110
	Understanding Democracy				.091 .009	.104 .003	.105 .002	.115 .001
	Demand Democracy				-.018 .634	-.012 .740	-.013 .730	-.018 .633
	Internal Efficacy				.302 .000	.308 .000	.307 .000	.297 .000
	Student Background Variables							
	Economic Insecurity					.091 .008	.097 .005	.088 .009
	Household SES					-.160 .000	-.138 .002	-.116 .008
	Student Race							
	Race White Dummy						-.099 .006	
	Race Black Dummy							.186 .000
Adj. R ²		.068	.076	.155	.248	.276	.282	.294
<i>n</i>								

School characteristics that are significant in earlier models, but fall away in subsequent models include: the socio-economic status of the school, the racial homogeneity of the school, the success with which the school transmits political knowledge/ average level of political knowledge at the school, and the bureaucratic efficiency of the school. The fact that these characteristics fall away is likely due to the overlap of school background characteristics, ‘modern school’ characteristics, and student level background characteristics. Nonetheless, the results are revealing, specifically those related to the socio-economic status of schools and students, as discussed below.

The large negative impact of socio-economic status (M1 and M2) and the small positive effect of racial homogeneity (associated with poorer schools) appears to be captured in subsequent models by the negative impact of school level political knowledge (Beta -.119 in M3 and Beta -.151 in M4), and then by the negative impact of student level socio-economic status (-.160 in M5). These results indicate that wealthier students are less likely to see themselves participating in legal forms of political activity in the future, with the exception of voting (explored in a later section). However, this is not necessarily reducible to their home backgrounds. Looking at the variables found to correlate with wealthier/ previously advantaged schools in the previous section, even where not statistically significant, the direction of the relationship is always negative. Thus, schools that are wealthier, more racially diverse, perform better academically and in the transmission political knowledge, and exhibit open classroom climates, do not appear to inculcate in students a participative disposition toward legal political participation.

At the student level, understanding democracy as a process (Beta .104 in M5) and the extent to which students feel that they understand politics, or internal efficacy, both have a positive effect (Beta .308 in M5). Interestingly, neither correspond with student level political knowledge, which has a negative, although not significant, relationship (Beta -.051 in M5), or school level academic performance or political knowledge, which are both negative, although also not significant (Beta -.024 and Beta -.091, respectively in M5). Instead of being related to the transmission of political knowledge then, it appears that large impact of internal efficacy (something which will be discussed in the following section) is related to the frequency of

political discussion (Beta .256 in M3, then Beta .172 after the introduction of 'student level internal efficacy').

Controlling for race through introducing race as dummy variable in separate models, the white and african/black dummy models are significant ('Race White' and 'Race Black' in table 5.6). From these models, it is apparent that african/black students are more likely to be positively disposed towards legal participation than other racial groups (Beta .186), while respondents who identify as white are less likely to be positively disposed towards legal participation in comparison (Beta -.099). Race is clearly a significant determinant of attitudes to legal political participation among Cape Town 'born free' school students. It is interesting to note that with the introduction of the african/black race dummy variable, the effect of a fair and caring school environment falls away completely. Recalling that students at DET and WCED schools, which are typically racially homogenous and serve mainly black students, experience school as more fair and caring than students at other schools, this may indicate a cultural difference between these schools and others, and/or a cultural difference that students bring to school from similar home backgrounds. In addition, bureaucratic efficiency is once again significant in the 'Race Black' results column (Beta .078). There are other slight changes in the Beta coefficients of significant variables in both dummy variable models, which generally support the direction of the race Beta coefficients.

Together, the results oppose the 'modern school' hypothesis but lend support to the 'democratic school' hypothesis. Although these models are not necessarily in conflict, the 'democratic school' model has greater explanatory power (increasing adjusted R-squared value by .079) and the hypothesis is largely supported by the direction of relationships between independent variables and the dependent variable. In contrast, the 'modern school' model is disconfirmed when looking at the impact of the school on Cape Town 'born free' students' disposition toward legal political participation. This will be addressed in the discussion in the next session.

Students' Disposition Toward Illegal Participation

Even though illegal political participation is largely considered undesirable, it is important to understand this component of political participation given the high levels of political protest and other illegal political activity in South Africa. In the CAS 2012

questionnaire, students were asked how likely it would be that they take illegal political action some time in the future, namely: blocking traffic and/or occupying a public building as a form of protest. Together, these make up the dependent variable component: disposition toward illegal participation. Looking at the results presented in table 5.7, the school seems to have a definite impact on students' dispositions towards participation in illegal political activities.

Working from model 1 through to model 5, school characteristics that have a direct impact on the likelihood that students will participate through illegal channels include: the racial homogeneity of the school (Beta .094) and the frequency of political discussion (Beta .174). That the frequency of political discussion is again positively associated with student dispositions toward illegal participation suggests that frequent political discussion increases students' overall disposition toward political participation. This is further explored in the discussion.

School characteristics that are significant in earlier models, but fall away in subsequent models include: socio-economic status (Beta -.196 in M1 and Beta -.133 in M2) and academic performance (Beta -.106 in M2). Somewhat unsurprisingly, these results indicate that students at wealthier and better performing schools are unlikely to participate through illegal means.

At the student level, understanding democracy as a process has a positive impact on the likelihood that students will participate in illegal activity (Beta .098 in M5), while demand for democracy has a strong negative impact (Beta -.227 in M5). That students who support democracy are less likely to participate in illegal political activity is reassuring. Previous research has shown that political knowledge and understanding democracy as a process (both of which the school can influence through civics courses) positively relate to student's demand for democracy (Mattes, Denemark & Niemi, 2012). However, this research also finds that demand for democracy is affected by student's confidence in the economic system, their experience of economic insecurity and their expected educational attainment. Thus, learning about democracy may have the opposite effect in settings students are faced with the disjuncture between what is promised by democracy and what their lived experience is. Therefore, students' disappointment in the processes or institutions of democracy might account for the positive effect that understanding democracy as a process has on dispositions toward illegal protest here.

Table 5.7 Regression Results: Dependent Variable Illegal Participation

		Model 1 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 2 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 3 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 4 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 5 (Beta, Sig.)
School Level	School Background					
	Socio-Economic Status	-.196 .000	-.133 .001	-.057 .295	-.050 .347	-.018 .738
	Racial Homogeneity	.136 .000	.095 .014	.093 .016	.100 .008	.094 .014
	Modern School Model					
	Academic Performance		-.106 .019	-.065 .166	-.062 .176	-.065 .161
	Political Knowledge		-.064 .150	-.065 .271	-.004 .946	.029 .646
	Bureaucratic Efficiency		.038 .281	.071 .054	.065 .074	.058 .112
	Democratic School Model					
	Participative Ethos			.066 .149	.054 .232	.047 .298
	Decision Making			.009 .814	.013 .729	.001 .989
	School Environment			.022 .618	.021 .630	.010 .823
	Classroom Climate			-.040 .417	-.010 .839	-.010 .832
	Freq. Political Discussion			.202 .000	.182 .000	.174 .000
	Students Raise Politics			-.041 .330	-.029 .491	-.039 .334
Student Level	Student Intervening Variables					
	Political Knowledge				-.022 .601	-.022 .597
	Understanding Democracy				.093 .012	.098 .009
	Demand Democracy				-.231 .000	-.227 .000
	Internal Efficacy				.032 .351	.035 .314
	Student Background Variables					
	Economic Insecurity					.060 .102
	Household SES					-.076 .100
	Adj. R ²	.072	.083	.119	.160	.166
	<i>n</i>					807

Taken together, the ‘born free’ students that are most likely to participate in illegal political activity in the CAS 2012 sample, are those that attend racially homogenous schools (which are more likely to be poor schools) and/or schools where politics is discussed regularly, and/or who understand democracy as a process but do not support

democracy. These results suggest that positive dispositions toward illegal behaviour may result from the frustration of those students who are interested in and understand politics but have been disappointed or become disaffected by the poor performance of democracy in South Africa.

Students' Disposition Toward Voting

In the CAS 2012 survey, students were asked whether or not they would be likely to vote in elections. This is operationalized as the dependent variable component: disposition toward voting. Looking at the results presented in table 5.8, the school appears to have little impact on student's attitudes toward voting.

Working from model 1 through to model 5, school characteristics that have a direct impact on the likelihood that students will vote include: the extent of student participation in school organisations (Beta .098 in M5) and the extent to which students consider decision making inclusive and democratic (-.079 in M5). School characteristics that are significant in earlier models, but fall away in subsequent models include: political knowledge (Beta .141 in M1) and the frequency of political discussion (Beta .121 in M3). All together, the school level models have little explanatory value. However, the positive effect of high levels of participation in school organisations is an important result, as it is something that can be instituted through the school either through setting participation requirements or supporting students in creating student groups. The negative relationship between students feeling that they are involved in decision-making and voting is somewhat perplexing. It indicates that schools in which students play a decision-making role might provide a negative experience of democracy, possibly through exposing students to inequality in or the ineffectuality of democratic in decision-making.

Table 5.8 Regression Results: Dependent Variable Voting

		Model 1 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 2 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 3 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 4 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 5 (Beta, Sig.)	Race White
School Level	School Background						
	Socio-Economic Status	.033 .375	.000 .991	.049 .393	.020 .720	.021 .715	.022 .700
	Racial Homogeneity	-.004 .914	.041 .304	.051 .206	.038 .332	.036 .354	.031 .432
	Modern School Model						
	Academic Performance		-.034 .468	-.029 .560	-.050 .289	-.054 .253	-.065 .172
	Political Knowledge		.141 .002	.118 .057	.014 .824	.022 .726	-.004 .952
	Bureaucratic Efficiency		.033 .366	.060 .121	.041 .272	.038 .302	.033 .379
	Democratic School Model						
	Participative Ethos			.084 .082	.103 .028	.098 .037	.075 .115
	Decision Making			-.091 .020	-.074 .049	-.079 .038	-.073 .052
	School Environment			.055 .240	.050 .261	.050 .272	.063 .165
	Classroom Climate			.048 .358	.037 .467	.035 .484	.035 .487
	Freq. Political Discussion			.121 .001	.066 .064	.065 .072	.068 .058
	Students Raise Politics			-.037 .396	-.027 .527	-.033 .444	-.034 .421
Student Level	Student Intervening Variables						
	Political Knowledge				-.041 .340	-.038 .370	-.044 .298
	Understanding Democracy				.208 .000	.205 .000	.204 .000
	Demand Democracy				.134 .001	.138 .001	.138 .001
	Internal Efficacy				.136 .000	.134 .000	.135 .000
	Student Background Variables						
	Economic Insecurity					.051 .173	.045 .228
	Household SES					.010 .826	-.013 .794
	Student Race						
	Race White Dummy						.103 .009
	Adj. R ²	-.001	.009	.033	.108	.108	.115
<i>n</i>							817

With the introduction of student level variables, the regression model's adjusted R-squared increases to .108 (from .033), which suggests the school may impact a students' disposition toward voting only insofar as it increases the student's understanding of democracy as a process (Beta .205), demand for democracy (Beta .138) and internal efficacy (Beta .134). That frequency of political discussion again becomes insignificant with the introduction of student level variables suggests that its effect is indirect, likely through increasing internal efficacy. However, the magnitude of the jump in adjusted r-squared suggests that these student level variables are influenced by factors outside of the school as well.

The socio-economic background of students does not appear to influence dispositions toward voting. However, introducing race as a dummy variable reveals that white students are more likely to be positively disposed toward voting than those belonging to other racial groups (Beta .103). In addition, in the 'Race White' results, all school level variables become insignificant, suggesting that race is the primary determinant for white students.

Together, the results suggest that the school has little effect on student dispositions toward voting. Future research should thus look to other determinants and/or socialising agents, such as the family, media and peers.

Students' Political Engagement

Fostering an interest in politics and public affairs is an important aspect of the school's role in educating for democratic citizenship. In the CAS 2012 survey, students were asked to rate how interested they are in politics. This is operationalized as the dependent variable component: political engagement. Looking at the results presented in table 5.9, the school seems to have a definite impact on political engagement. However, it is student level variables that account for the great explanatory value of the final regression, specifically student's internal efficacy (contributing to an adjusted R-squared of .300 in M5).

Table 5.9 Regression Results: Dependent Variable Political Engagement

		Model 1 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 2 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 3 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 4 (Beta, Sig.)	Model 5 (Beta, Sig.)
School Level	School Background					
	Socio-Economic Status	-.088 .001	-.093 .001	.008 .884	-.014 .691	.003 .934
	Racial Homogeneity	.038 .142	.059 .035	.051 .063	.056 .021	.054 .025
	Modern School Model					
	Academic Performance		-.078 .017	-.019 .574	-.032 .282	-.032 .281
	Political Knowledge		.113 .000	.046 .271	-.014 .718	.001 .970
	Bureaucratic Efficiency		.016 .521	.073 .006	.053 .021	.052 .025
	Democratic School Model					
	Participative Ethos			.064 .049	.048 .088	.045 .112
	Decision Making			-.008 .754	-.025 .293	-.031 .192
	School Environment			.040 .201	.035 .203	.025 .377
	Classroom Climate			-.063 .073	-.044 .159	-.045 .114
	Freq. Political Discussion			.249 .000	.124 .000	.121 .000
	Students Raise Politics			.069 .020	.055 .034	-.051 .050
Student Level	Student Intervening Variables					
	Political Knowledge				.006 .815	.008 .768
	Understanding Democracy				.063 .007	.066 .005
	Demand Democracy				.029 .242	.031 .216
	Internal Efficacy				.495 .000	.458 .000
	Student Background Variables					
	Economic Insecurity					.029 .221
	Household SES					-.044 .112
	Student Race					
	Race White Dummy					
	Adj. R ²	.010	.017	.088	.298	.300
	<i>n</i>	1661				

Working from model 1 through to model 5, school characteristics that have a direct impact on the likelihood that students will be politically engaged include: racial homogeneity (Beta .054 in M5), bureaucratic efficiency (Beta 0.52 in M5), the frequency of political discussion (Beta .121 in M5) and the frequency with which students raise politics in class (Beta .051 in M5). That the frequency with which politics is discussed and with which students raise politics in class positively relates to interest in politics is intuitively compelling. However, the significance of racial homogeneity and bureaucratic efficiency is not expected. Interpreting these results, it is likely that discussion of controversial topics, especially those related to race, might be easier and less uncomfortable in classrooms where there is less racial diversity and where discussion happens in a structured environment.

School characteristics that are significant in earlier models, but fall away in subsequent models include: socio-economic status (Beta -.088 in M1, Beta -.093 in M2), academic performance (Beta -.078 in M2), political knowledge (Beta .113 in M2) and a participative ethos (Beta .064 in M1). Background school characteristics and those related to the 'modern school' model, with the exception of bureaucratic efficiency, fall away with the introduction of 'democratic school' model variables. In addition, the adjusted R-squared increases considerably (from .017 in M2 to .088 in M3). The 'democratic school' model thus appears to be of greater explanatory value, with the frequency of political discussion standing out.

However, it is with the introduction of student level variables that the explanatory value increases drastically (adjusted R-squared increasing from .088 in M3 to .298 in M4). This is mainly attributable to the huge effect of internal efficacy on political engagement (Beta .458 in M5), and to a lesser degree the extent to which students understand democracy as a process (Beta .066 in M5). While this is at least somewhat explained by the frequency of political discussion and a participative ethos at school, there is clearly some other determinant of internal efficacy that accounts for this effect. This bears further investigation. Student level background control variables, related to socio-economic status and race, are not significant.

All together, the results offer little support to the 'modern school' model and provide some support to the 'democratic school' model. Again, the frequency with which students discuss politics at school stands out in the analysis, as does student's internal efficacy.

KEY RESULTS

The regression results presented above confirm that the school does have an impact on Cape Town ‘born free’ students’ political engagement and dispositions toward political participation. In this section, I focus on the school and student characteristics that stand out in the regression analysis, specifically: the positive impact of frequent political discussion at school, the ‘intervening’ variables of internal efficacy, demand for democracy and a procedural understanding of democracy, and lastly the negative effect of school’s academic performance, average political knowledge and students socio-economic background. In table 5.10 below, the final regression results are presented in a simplified form, with the direction of the Beta coefficient indicated by a plus or minus symbol (+/-) and significant results enlarged.

Table 5.10 Final Regression Results: Dependent Variable Components

		Legal Participation	Illegal Participation	Voting Participation	Political Engagement
School Level	School Background				
	Socio-Economic Status	+	-	+	+
	Racial Homogeneity	+	+	+	+
	Modern School Model				
	Academic Performance	-	-	-	-
	Political Knowledge	-	+	+	+
	Bureaucratic Efficiency	+	+	+	+
	Democratic School Model				
	Participative Ethos	+	+	+	+
	Decision Making	-	+	-	-
	Environment	+	+	+	+
	Classroom Climate	-	-	+	-
	Freq. Political Discussion	+	+	+	+
	Students Raise Politics	+	-	-	+
Student Level	Intervening Variables				
	Political Knowledge	-	-	-	+
	Understanding Democracy	+	+	+	+
	Demand Democracy	-	-	+	+
	Internal Efficacy	+	+	+	+
	Background Variables				
	Economic Insecurity	+	+	+	+
	Household SES	-	-	+	-
Adj. R ²		.276	.166	.108	.300
<i>n</i>		808	807	807	1661

A Political Education: Political Discussion at School

The frequency with which politics is discussed at school is found to have a positive effect on student's dispositions toward legal participation, illegal participation, and interest in politics. While part of the 'democratic school' model, it also connects with the 'modern school' model, as the discussion of political issues increases political knowledge and understanding, as well as internal efficacy. However, it is the experience of political discussion rather than learning about politics that seems to have this effect, likely by exposing students to the "real world of political issues,

[and] the lifeblood of participatory democracy, namely discourse and debate” (Campbell, 2008: 33). Through “wrestling with important social and political issues, the youth develop a familiarity with the political landscape, including the institutions, processes, positions, and personalities that shape its contours” and an appreciation or acceptance of conflict, discussion and debate is likely to arise, contributing to an engaged and participatory disposition that does not shy away from the political (Campbell, 2008: 34).

In the South African context, it is understandable that the discussion of politics may be especially efficacious. In ‘post-conflict’ societies, such as South Africa, (see Quaynor, 2013: 41), controversial or political issues are often avoided, and an authoritarian school and classroom culture is used to insulate students from the larger socio-political conditions in society. Depending only upon formal education, including civics courses, in such a context is unlikely to develop politically engaged and participative dispositions among the youth. Conversely, frequent political discussion across classes allows for students to become familiar with politics, socialising students into the norms of political discussion and debate, and galvanising politically engaged civic identities. However, it is also important to acknowledge the potential that political discussion has to stir up anger, frustration and possibly anti-establishment sentiment given the high levels of inequality and political controversy in South Africa. In order to countenance this effect, civics courses should not only aim to increase political knowledge but to advance a critical understanding of democracy that enables students to grapple with the disappointment and contradictions that democracy poses (Hedke & Zimenkova, 2013).

Civic Identity: Internal Efficacy, Demand for Democracy and a Procedural Understanding of Democracy

In addition to the frequency of political discussion, internal efficacy stands out as a strong predictor of politically engaged and participative dispositions among the Cape Town ‘born free’ students. Internal efficacy has a strong positive impact on dispositions toward legal participation, voting and interest in politics. Looking at school level determinants of internal efficacy, it is the frequency of political discussion that stands out. However, internal efficacy is also likely influenced by other factors external to the school, such as discussion of politics at home, access to and use of news media, and possibly membership in external organisations.

Although to a lesser degree, a procedural understanding of democracy also contributes positively to the development of a politically engaged and participative disposition. It has an especially strong effect on student's reported likelihood of voting, and it has a moderate impact on the reported likelihood of legal and illegal participation. Because a procedural understanding of democracy places greater emphasis on the mechanisms of democracy (elections, freedom of expression, limits on government power etc.) it might at the same time predispose students to an understanding of citizenship as participatory.

Lastly, demand for democracy is significant in the regression of illegal participation and voting. As found in previous research, "various parts of the educational process can indeed make students 'more democratic'" or more likely to 'demand democracy', especially those related to the transmission of political knowledge" (Mattes, Denemark & Niemi, 2012:2). The positive, though moderate, effect of a student's demand for democracy on voting, and its strong negative effect on the likelihood of participation through illegal channels, provides support to the value of the 'modern school' model.

Inequality and Difference: An Apathetic Upper Class?

Although the positive effects of frequent political discussion at school, as well as student's internal efficacy, understanding of democracy and demand for democracy, on the 'born free' disposition toward political engagement and participation are heartening, the persistent negative influence of a higher socio-economic status, including through the academic performance of the school and the average level of political knowledge (civic education performance) is disconcerting. Effectively, this means those with better resources, including material, human and social, are 'opting out' of politics. Student's who attend schools with higher average levels of political knowledge and academic achievement, and who come from higher socio-economic backgrounds are less likely to participate through legal and illegal channels, or to be interested in politics. While common wisdom finds socio-economic status to have a strong bearing on all forms of political engagement and participation, the expectation is for this relationship to be positive. However, in South Africa the inverse is found. Thus, while improving formal education, including civic education, across schools is imperative to the development of a knowledgeable, skilled and democratic citizenry, equally important is tackling the apparent apathy in the upper segments of society.

In the next and final chapter, I reflect on the research problem, rationale and questions that have motivated this dissertation, review the results, and conclude with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In South Africa, a country still reeling from the violence of its authoritarian past, confronting the challenges associated with socio-economic inequality under conditions of sluggish economic development and burdened with a systemic crisis in education, how can the school contribute to the development of a democratic culture in order to strengthen and consolidate democracy? Driving this research is the personal conviction that a key way in which the school can and should do this, is to inculcate among students engaged and participatory attitudes toward civic life. This conviction is founded on a long tradition of political philosophy, critical pedagogy and political socialisation theory, as well as a recent turn to school environment and climate in civic education research that tests this work. However, little of this theory has been developed or tested in developing countries where it is yet uncertain whether new democratic regimes, beset with on-going inequality, poverty and vestiges of the old order, can use schools to impart a new set of norms, sensibilities and commitments to a fundamentally new, democratic future. This dissertation contributes to filling this gap, exploring the ways in which schools can influence the youth so that they may become active, engaged and participatory citizens in the South African setting. In this chapter, I review the results and conclude with recommendations for future research.

SCHOOL DETERMINANTS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION

Through this research, I have shown that the school can and does influence young South Africans' political engagement and dispositions toward participation in legal and illegal political activities, as well as voting. The school characteristic that most clearly stands out in this regard is the frequency with which politics is discussed at school. In addition, a participative ethos, or high levels of participation in school governance and organisations, and a fair and caring school environment correspond to positive dispositions toward voting and legal political participation, respectively. In terms of the school's socio-economic and demographic characteristics, higher levels of racial homogeneity correspond with higher levels of political engagement and dispositions toward illegal activity. At the individual level, students who understand democracy as a process and who exhibit higher levels of internal efficacy, both

characteristics thought to be influenced by the school, are more likely to be politically engaged and positively disposed toward all forms of political participation. Considering students' socio-economic and demographic backgrounds, an individual student's experience of economic insecurity and being African positively relates to participatory dispositions toward legal political activity, while a higher socio-economic status and being white corresponds negatively. However, white students are more likely to vote.

While the results certainly support the overarching thesis that the school can influence students' political engagement and dispositions toward political participation, the South African education system continues to reflect the inequalities and divides of the past. This means that results should be tempered by an understanding of the schooling landscape, and the persistent disparities between schools.

The results show that schools remain largely distinct from one another in terms of academic performance, socio-economic status and demographic characteristics when organised according to previous administration (the racially defined CED, HOR and DET groups). Schools that perform well academically are most often better resourced, previously white (CED) or Independent (IND), and serve students from higher socio-economic status backgrounds. This now includes students from all racial groups, but a narrow white majority remains in most of these schools. Meanwhile, underperforming schools are most often under-resourced, previously coloured or African (HOR or DET) or newer schools (WCED) that serve coloured and African students from low socio-economic backgrounds almost exclusively.

However, the results also reveal differences between these groups across other school characteristics. Wealthier schools (specifically previously white/CED) have higher average levels of political knowledge, which is intuitively compelling as this likely corresponds with overall academic performance. However, these schools fall below average in the extent to which students experience the school as fair and caring, perceive decision-making to be inclusive, the frequency with which politics is discussed and the level of student participation in school governance and other organisations. Conversely, poorer schools (specifically previously African/DET and WCED) have below average political knowledge, again intuitively compelling. However, these schools are above average on the afore-mentioned characteristics (with the exception of the frequency of political discussion, which is below average at

previously DET schools and highest at WCED schools). Meanwhile, HOR schools fall somewhere in-between for the most part, although they have the lowest levels of student participation in school organisations.

Taken together, and interpreted with reference to the ‘modern school’ and ‘democratic school’ perspectives, it seems that those school characteristics associated with a ‘democratic school’ are of greater relevance in developing politically engaged and participative dispositions among Cape Town ‘born frees’. Academic performance, bureaucratic efficiency and the successful transmission of political knowledge, those characteristics associated with the ‘modern school’ perspective, do not seem to have a great influence overall. In fact, higher academic performance at the school level and higher levels of political knowledge at the individual level both correspond negatively (if not significantly) with student dispositions toward all forms of political participation. This, in contrast with the high importance of internal efficacy (an individual’s sense that they understand and can meaningfully contribute to political and/or civic life) and understanding democracy as a process (rather than instrumentally), suggests that the school’s role in educating for democracy needs to extend beyond formal education/‘cognitive development’ and the transmission of factual information. Instead, the school needs to provide an environment within which students can develop politically engaged and participative attitudes by bringing politics into the classroom, encouraging participation in school governance and other organisations, and promoting caring and fair relationships between students, and between students and staff.

What is particularly reassuring in these results is the relatively small impact that socio-economic status (school and individual level) and race have on ‘born frees’ political engagement and attitudes toward political participation. Where results are significant, it is poorer students or those whose racial designation would have previously excluded them from the polity that are most likely to be politically engaged and participate (with the exception of voting). Conversely, wealthier students are less likely to be interested in politics and participate (with the exception of voting) despite the ‘better’ education provided by the schools that these students attend. This can be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, students at wealthier schools may simply be further removed from the social, socio-economic and community challenges that would otherwise motivate civic and political engagement. Cape Town

remains highly segregated socio-economically and along racial lines, with wealthier suburbs virtually insulated from the extreme social ills which plague poorer neighbourhoods and informal settlements, such as gang violence, poverty, and deprivation (Seekings, 2010). On the other hand, looking back at the results on the distribution of 'modern' and 'democratic' school characteristics in the Cape Town school landscape, wealthier schools fall below, and poorer schools above, average in the extent to which students experience the school as fair and caring, perceive decision-making to be inclusive, the frequency with which politics is discussed and the level of student participation in school governance and other organisations. Therefore, the impact of socio-economic status and race might be underlined by different school environments and educational experiences between these groups.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the early years of the democratic transition and following the radical education reforms in the 1990s, there was great hope that the post-apartheid generation 'born free' of the institutionalised racism of apartheid would make a distinct move towards pro-democratic values, civic engagement and active political participation. However, twenty years later, the promise of equal, quality and democratic education remains unfulfilled and the 'born frees' have yet to demonstrate the values, attitudes and behaviours associated with a supportive democratic political culture. However, there are rumblings of change. In 2015, 'born free' university students led a nation wide student protest movement, calling for an expedited process of transformation at institutions of higher education, as well as basic education. Most of the students involved in these protests graduated high school in the same year as the CAS 2012 group. Not only have these protests reignited the hope for a critical yet democratic 'born free' generation, but they have also roused interest in educational and school determinants of political values, attitudes and behaviour.

In this dissertation, I have shown that the school can and has positively influenced 'born free' students' political engagement and dispositions towards political participation, highlighting school characteristics that have had the greatest influence. From these results, a number of follow-on questions arise, yet fall outside of the scope of this work. In concluding, I thus make a number of recommendations for future research.

To begin with, it would be worthwhile to test the strength of the relationship between the ‘born frees’ political engagement and attitudes toward political participation during adolescence, and actual civic and political participation in adult life. Although previous research finds a strong relationship in other contexts, the systemic institutional, educational and resource inequality in South Africa may distort this relationship. One way that CAS 2012 could be used to do this would involve a follow up survey of the original group. In the CAS 2012 survey, students were asked for their cell phone numbers, their parents cell phone numbers, as well as their home address. Therefore, a secondary panel would likely be relatively straightforward, yet could provide significant insight into determinants of political engagement and participation, specifically protest action (violent and non-violent).

Secondly, it would be worthwhile to test the findings presented in this dissertation in the other large metropolitan areas (Durban, Johannesburg and Pretoria), as well as rural areas. Due to differences in provincial government, socio-economic conditions, and possibly cultural and/or historical legacies, the results may differ significantly.

Lastly, the positive results drawn from this analysis support a deeper exploration of the differences that exist between schools that goes beyond the already well-traversed intersection of race, socio-economic status and academic performance, and the effect that these differences have on students’ political engagement and attitudes toward different types of political behaviour. This could be done in a number of ways. For example, building from the results presented in this dissertation and using CAS 2012, a sample could be drawn for qualitative study. Alternatively, the CAS 2012 data could be used to further test the effect of individual level school experience in different settings. Both these, and other approaches, could contribute significantly to our understanding of school determinants of political engagement and political participation among ‘born free’ South Africans.

South Africa’s enduring crisis in education has contributed to a stark portrayal of functional vs dysfunctional schools, a divide carved out during the racially defined expansion of public education in the previous century. Such a dichotomy is all too easily applied to other aspects of education, including education for democratic citizenship. However, the analysis presented in this dissertation indicates a more

varied school landscape, specifically with regards to the division and effect of 'democratic school' characteristics. This has definite implications for our understanding of South Africa's nascent democratic political culture, as well as the educational and school determinants that will contribute to its flourishing.

APPENDIX A (PART 1): CAS 2012 SURVEY DESIGN AND FIELDWORK

1. Project Description

Earlier research conducted by Professor Mattes has demonstrated that the ‘*Born Free*’ generation in South Africa, that is, younger South Africans who have come of age since the advent of democracy, are *less* supportive of democracy than their parents or grandparents. Based on this, and by means of the funding provided by the South African National Research Foundation, as well as the World Universities Network; we were able to conduct an empirical study on democracy and citizenship education in South Africa’s schools.

The first phase of this study, which was approved by the Western Cape Education Department, concentrated on Cape Town. We therefore interviewed a representative sample of Grade 11 learners from the Cape Town metropolitan area, their History and Life Orientation teachers, as well as a sub-sample of their parents in order to:

- Empirically examine what the country’s future citizens think and know about democracy and citizenship, the future of South Africa’s democracy as well as the country’s *apartheid* past; and
- Empirically gauge the relative influence of the citizenship element of the current History and Life Orientation curricula; the school and local community; as well as the media and the family on these attitudes and opinions.

From a more practical perspective, the study therefore aimed to:

- Conduct structured survey interviews with Grade 11 high school learners from one History class and one Life Orientation class across a random representative sample of 51 high schools in the Cape Town metropolitan area;
- Conduct structured survey interviews with the teachers of these History and Life Orientation classes;
- Conduct structured survey interviews (by telephone) with a sub-sample of the parents of learners surveyed.

2. The Sampling Methodology

Grade 11 learners in Life Orientation (LO) and History classes in Cape Town metropolitan schools were the target population. Researchers using the data should however be aware that in South Africa a significant number of learners drop-out from high school after completing Grade 9. Thus while our study is intended to be representative of the Grade 11 population of learners in Cape Town metropolitan schools, it is not representative of the entire population of a particular age group.

The Learner and Teacher Samples

The sample of 51 schools was drawn from the existing school population of 241 schools in the Cape Town metropolitan area and took into consideration the following school characteristics: former school administration; school performance as measured by 2011 Matric pass rates; and school size, which was based on a school's population of Grade 11 learners.

More specifically:

- For former school administration, schools were characterised as being administered by the Cape Education Department (former White), House of Representatives (former Coloured), Department of Education and Training (former Black) or Western Cape Education Department (schools established post-1994). This information was officially obtained from a senior official within the Western Cape Education Department.
- For school performance, schools were characterised as poorer performing if their 2011 Matric pass rates were 73.47% or less; as medium performing if their 2011 Matric pass rates were between 73.48% and 92.66%; and high performing if their 2011 Matric pass rates were 92.67% and above. These percentage points were calculated from the distribution of 2011 matric pass rates for all 241 schools which was obtained from official documentation compiled by the national Department of Education.
- And for size, schools were characterised as small if their Grade 11 population consisted of less than 166 learners, and large if their Grade 11 population consisted of more than 166 learners. The median point, 166, was calculated from the distribution of Grade 11 population sizes for all 241 schools which was obtained from the Western Cape Education Department's website.

Based on this criteria, we:

- Calculated how many schools fell into each stratum of former school administration X school performance X school size (see the first column in Table 1 below);⁶
- Calculated the school population proportions for each stratum;
- Calculated the sample count for each stratum based on a desired sample size of 51 schools;
- Adjusted the sample allocation for each stratum based on a desired sample of 51 schools; and
- Selected a random probabilistic sample from each stratum by making use of random numbers, which were generated by Random Number Generator computer software.

Table 1: Population and Sample Frame of Cape Town Schools

Strata	Population		Sample	
	#	%	#	Adjusted allocation
Independent/High/Small	24	10.0	5.1	5
Independent/Medium/Small	4	1.7	0.8	1
Independent/Poorer/Small	4	1.7	0.8	1
HOR/High/Large	6	2.5	1.3	1
HOR/High/Small	7	2.9	1.5	2
HOR/Medium/Large	25	10.4	5.3	5
HOR/Medium/Small	23	9.5	4.9	5
HOR/Poorer/Large	13	5.4	2.8	3
HOR/Poorer/Small	23	9.5	4.9	5
HOR/X/Small	1	0.4	0.2	0
CED/High/Large	26	10.8	5.5	6
CED/High/Small	18	7.5	3.8	4
CED/Medium/Small	5	2.1	1.1	1
CED/Medium/Large	1	0.4	0.2	0
CED/Poorer/Small	2	0.8	0.4	0
DET/Medium/Large	11	4.6	2.3	2
DET/Poorer/Larger	21	8.7	4.4	4
DET/Poorer/Small	2	0.8	0.4	0
WCED/High/Small	1	0.4	0.2	0
WCED/Medium/Large	7	2.9	1.5	2

⁶ Some might ask whether each individual characteristic in the population is equally represented in the sample. The response is 'Yes'. Presenting proportions of individual characteristics rather than combined one is just indicative / descriptive. It does not allow one to drawn multistratified random sample as the likelihood of selecting the same school more than once is high. The combined characteristic method guarantees that only one school is selected.

WCED/Medium/Small	1	0.4	0.2	0
WCED/Poorer/Large	10	4.1	2.1	2
WCED/Poorer/Small	3	1.2	0.6	1
WCED/X/Small	3	1.2	0.6	1
TOTAL	241	100.0	51.0	51

An additional secondary sample of 88 schools was also selected for the main purpose of replacing schools in the primary sample. Replacing a school in the primary sample occurred in the event of:

- a) A school selected in the primary sample refusing to participate in the study;
- b) The project manager, after numerous attempts, was unable to establish any kind of contact with the school selected in the primary sample either via telephone or email; and
- c) A school selected in the primary sample had significantly prolonged attempts to cooperate with the project.

A non-responding school was replaced with another school from the same stratum as the non-responding school. 10 of the 51 schools (approximately 20%) in the primary sample were replaced by schools in the secondary sample for one of the three reasons mentioned above.

However, this sampling methodology selected a representative sample of 51 schools to be ideally included in the study, but it did not in any way specify which History and Life Orientation classes within these schools would in reality participate in the study and by extension which learners and teachers would complete the learner and teacher questionnaires respectively. The selection of History and Life Orientation classes was left at the discretion of the school principle or the teacher in charge of the Grade 11 cohort at the school, even though every effort was made to ensure that the study was able to gain access to one History class and one Life Orientation class at the schools where History is offered as a subject. As such, the History and/or Life Orientation teachers who were included in the study were based on the Grade 11 classes that were selected to participate in the study. The study did however have one instance where a language class was selected to participate in the study and several instances where a teacher that was not associated with the class that participated in the study completed the teacher questionnaire – approximately 15% of the teachers who completed the teacher survey were not associated with the class that participated in the study.

The Parent Sample

1002 parents of the learners' who participated in the study were interviewed via telephone by *Progressus Research and Development*, a research company based in Johannesburg. The learner questionnaire asked learners to provide up to two contact numbers for their parents/guardians and these numbers were subsequently used to conduct the telephone survey. The parents of learners who had not provided a contact phone number were not eligible for the parent survey sample. Of the 2 524 learners who completed the learner questionnaire, 2 468 provided a phone number for at least one of their parents/guardians, although many of these numbers proved to be incorrect as the telephone survey progressed.

To select the parents/guardians for the phone survey, learners were randomly selected from within classes. The target sample size for each class was $[6 + (0.2 \times \text{total number of respondents in the class})]$ rounded to the nearest whole number. Thus, the parent survey oversampled (as a proportion of the class size) smaller classes, guaranteed a minimum number of parents were interviewed per class and gave a total target sample of about 1000 parents. When a parent/guardian could not be reached telephonically after several attempts, or if a parent/guardian refused to participate in the study, a replacement was drawn from within the same class until the target sample number for the class was reached.

3. The Field Work Process: The Learner and Teacher Survey

Approaching the Schools

The three schools that formed part of the pilot study were selected and approached based on existing connections that the Cape Town-based research team had with each of the three schools. The process of approaching schools was therefore fairly easy, although trying to coordinate a single day for which the field teams could administer the pilot questionnaire to all three schools proved slightly more difficult. For the main study however, the process of approaching the schools already preselected by the sampling process outlined in the previous section proved to be much more complex.

As an initial strategy, the project manager sent an email outlining the project's aims and ambitions as well as requesting their participation to all 51 schools preselected in the sample. School email addresses were obtained from the Western Cape Education

Department's website as well as school websites (where one existed). This initial strategy resulted in responses from only a handful of schools and as such proved mostly ineffective. The project manager then attempted to follow-up the email initially sent out with a telephone call to the principle of the school. In many cases, especially in the historically Black and historically Coloured schools, the email had not been received as the email addresses obtained from the Western Cape Education Department website proved to not be functional. Whilst this strategy proved mildly effective and resulted in the scheduling of appointments for the survey interviews with several schools, there was a clear selection bias in terms of what types of schools were willing and able to cooperate over the telephone. Historically Black schools as well as poorer historically Coloured schools proved to be the most difficult schools to establish contact with telephonically. As a result, field teams visited many of these schools more specifically in order to convince them to participate in the study as well as to arrange a suitable time to conduct the survey interviews with these schools. All the while, the project manager continued to liaise and schedule appointments with the schools that were willing and able to cooperate over the telephone.

The Field Workers

Nine experienced field workers were recruited to execute the field work for both the pilot survey and the main survey. Due to unforeseen circumstances, one of the field workers who executed the pilot survey field work was not able to execute the main survey field work as well. Therefore, an additional field worker had to be recruited in the middle of the overall field work process for the purposes of executing the main survey field work. Nevertheless, field workers were sourced through already-existing connections of the Cape Town-based research team as well as the Centre for Social Science Research. They were selected not only on the basis of their survey field work experience, but also on their ability to speak two of the three languages spoken in the Western Cape, that is Afrikaans, English, and/or IsiXhosa. The nine field workers were subsequently arranged into three teams of three based on the languages that they spoke and the languages spoken in the schools that they would be conducting the survey interviews. The three teams, and the nine field workers who comprised them, had the following characteristics:

Table 2: Field Workers

	<i>Home Language</i>	<i>Other Languages Spoken</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Population Group</i>
<i>Team 1</i>				
Team Leader	Afrikaans	English	Male	White
Field Worker 1	Afrikaans	English	Female	Coloured
Field Worker 2 (Pilot)	Afrikaans	English	Female	White
Field Worker 2 (Main)	Afrikaans	English	Female	Coloured
<i>Team 2</i>				
Team Leader	Afrikaans	English	Male	Coloured
Field Worker 1	IsiXhosa	Afrikaans, English, Zulu	Male	Black
Field Worker 2	English	Afrikaans	Female	Coloured
<i>Team 3</i>				
Team Leader	IsiXhosa	Afrikaans, English	Female	Black
Field Worker 1	IsiXhosa	English	Female	Black
Field Worker 2	IsiXhosa	English	Female	Black

Furthermore, whilst already experienced in conducting survey field work, field workers were nevertheless provided with the necessary training to conduct the field work for both the pilot study and the main study by the Cape Town-based research team.

Informed Consent

For the learners, we chose to not obtain parental consent prior to the survey interviews due to the fact that most of the respondents were at least 16 years of age. A parent information sheet was however prepared for distribution to parents. It was envisioned that the schools were to be responsible for ensuring that this information sheet was distributed to the relevant learners at least one week prior to the survey interviews at their school. This approach proved completely unpractical as many of the schools confirmed their participation 2-3 days prior to the day that they expected our field teams to conduct the survey interviews. As such, information sheets were only distributed to the learners at the time of the survey interview, which in turn means that we were not able to guarantee that parents did in fact receive this information sheet, even after the fact.

Nevertheless, learners and teachers were required to complete a consent form prior to completing the survey questionnaire. They were also provided with an important

contact information sheet in the event that they need to bring any general as well as ethical project concerns to the attention of the project team and/or the Centre for Social Science Research Ethics Committee. To the knowledge of the project manager, no complaints were brought to the attention of the project lead or the Centre for Social Science Research Ethics Committee.

The Survey Interviews

Survey interviews with learners and teachers took place from 14 August – 5 September 2012 which fell within the third term of the calendar school year. The survey interviews were conducted during a History and a Life Orientation class or two Life Orientation classes and as such took one class period to complete. The project team found that most schools were more willing to participate in our study in the event that the survey interviews were conducted with two Life Orientation classes rather than a History class and a Life Orientation class even though History is offered as a subject at the school. As a result, in a notable proportion of schools, the survey interviews were conducted with two Life Orientation classes.

Additionally, there were also a few cases where there was a duplication of learners in the classes selected to participate in the study. In other words, the same learners were present in both classes that were sampled. In these cases however, learners would complete the learner questionnaire in only one of the two classes; their non-participation in the other class was noted by the field worker or the field team leader. The learner however cannot be personally identified in the data. A final and anonymous list of the 45 schools who participated in the study as well as the subject classes can be found in Appendix A.

With regards to the teachers questionnaires moreover, field workers asked the teacher of the class being interviewed to remain in the classroom and complete the teacher questionnaire at the same time as the learners completed their questionnaire. In approximately 14% of the cases, teachers did not complete the teacher questionnaire at the same time as the learners completed their learner questionnaire. In addition, approximately 1% of the total possible sample of teachers simply refused to complete the teacher questionnaire altogether. Nevertheless, where a teacher taught both classes that participated in the study, the teacher only completed the teacher questionnaire once and in some cases, field workers sought an alternative teacher to complete an

additional teacher questionnaire. Where regular History and/or Life Orientation class teacher was not present on the day and/or unwilling to complete the teacher questionnaire, the field workers also sought an alternative teacher to complete the teacher questionnaire.

Both the learner and the teacher questionnaires were self-administered and as such, fieldwork teams were present to facilitate this self-administration process accordingly. Field work teams were however responsible for completing a classroom information form and a school information form for each classroom and each school sampled as a means of capturing important contextual information about the classrooms and the schools that were sampled in the study. Nevertheless, once completed, learners' and teachers' questionnaires were each given a school code and a class code and in the case of the learners, a learner code as well and in combination these codes serve as a unique identifier for each learner and teacher questionnaire. This not only allowed the matching of the teachers' responses to their learners' responses in the final dataset, but it also allowed the matching of parents' responses to their children's responses as well. In the cases where an alternative teacher completed the teacher questionnaire, the teacher's responses were not matched to any class of learners.

The Learner Questionnaire

The learner questionnaire consisted of four sections. Section A is a 'quiz' consisting of nine questions on the issues of civics and government in South Africa as well as South African history, Section B consists of questions that seek to understand learners' opinions about various public issues. Section C consists of questions that seek to explore the experiences of learners within their schools, and Section D consists of questions that capture the various demographic and socio-economic information of the learners. Many of these questions are identical and/or similar to questions from the Afrobarometer surveys, the 1999 International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Survey, and the 2009 IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. The survey questionnaire was created using QueXML open source software, which is compatible with the QueXF open source computer assisted data entry software.

The learner questionnaire (and teacher questionnaire) was also translated into Afrikaans as our primary sample consisted of schools that either have English,

English and Afrikaans, or Afrikaans as their primary language of instruction. It is interesting to note that a significant proportion of the Afrikaans-speaking learners from dual-medium English/Afrikaans schools more specifically chose to complete the English version of the learner questionnaire. There was one class in which only English questionnaires were available for students who would have preferred an Afrikaans questionnaire. The English questionnaire was translated into Afrikaans by one of the staff members, a native Afrikaans speaker, in the Centre for Social Science Research who regularly does translation work for the unit. It was unfortunately however only back-translated by another native Afrikaans speaker after the questionnaire was already in the field due to a series of unforeseen circumstances. The unintentional consequences were two slight differences in items C5a-d and D11 on the Afrikaans version of the questionnaire. For items C5a-d, the option *“I am not taking this subject”* is on the far right in the Afrikaans version as opposed to the far left as is the case on the English version. And for item D11, the first response option on the Afrikaans version, when back-translated, reads as: *“Deceased or does not live with me”* whereas the English version has the response option *“Deceased”* as second-to-last. Researchers do not necessarily need to make any special allowance in post-coding when making use of the variable, but they should be aware that English and Afrikaans learners saw a slightly different response order on this item.

Additionally, two versions of the learner questionnaire were also developed as a means of accommodating more questionnaire items. Therefore, each of the two versions differed only in that each contained a small number of items (items B14-B17) were present in one version of the questionnaire. Field workers randomly alternated the two versions of the learner questionnaire as they handed them out to learners during the survey interviews.

The Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire contains many of the same items as the learner questionnaire, but is structurally different. No knowledge quiz was given to teachers. Section A contains questions about the school, classroom and the teacher’s teaching methods. Section B contains questions on opinions about public issues and is similar to Section B in the learner questionnaire. Section C contains demographic and other socio-economic information about the teacher. The teacher questionnaire was also

offered in English and Afrikaans, with the translation procedure being the same as for the learner questionnaire.

Supplemental Information

As was mentioned earlier, fieldworkers also filled out forms containing information on the school and classroom environment, the number of learners present, absent and not completing the questionnaire, as well as other notable circumstances surrounding the administration of the survey interviews. The entirety of this data has not yet been entered into the main dataset and can therefore be made available upon request to individual researchers.

Survey Completion Rates

The learner questionnaire contained 147 items, a mean of 133.7 and a median of 144 items were completed by a sample of 2524 learners. Furthermore, whilst the questionnaire was structured in such a way so as to ensure completion within a 40-45 minute period, there was significant variation in the lengths of the class periods across the schools in the sample which in turn had an impact on completion rates. The historically White schools included in our sample tended to have class periods of approximately 50-55 minutes, while historically Black schools tended to have class periods of approximately 30-35 minutes with the length of the class periods of the historically Coloured schools falling somewhere in between. Whilst an empirical analysis of the data will need to confirm this, anecdotal evidence from the field work suggests that learner completion rates, for both the pilot study and the main study, were associated with whether the learner was from a historically White, a historically Black or a historically Coloured school. Moreover, familiarity and comfort with completing a survey questionnaire more so in English for many of the English second-language learners may have also played a significant role in learner completion rates.

Whilst teacher completion rates did not follow a similar pattern, a notable proportion of the teachers (14%) who participated in the main study more specifically did not complete their questionnaire during the class period assigned for the survey interviews. On a few occasions, fieldwork teams had to in fact return to the school on an alternative day in order to collect the completed teacher questionnaire. There were also a notable proportion of teachers (15%) who completed the teacher questionnaire

but were in fact not the teacher of the class that was selected to participate in the study. As has been already mentioned, this mostly occurred as a result of the same teacher teaching both classes selected to participate in the study, the class teacher of the class assigned to participate in the study not being present on the day or refusing to participate in the study altogether. And while there was very little skepticism from the teachers about completing the questionnaire overall, there were a few teachers (all of whom were from historically Black and historically Coloured schools) who simply refused to participate in the study.

4. The Field Work Process: The Parent Survey

As was mentioned earlier, telephone surveys with the parents were conducted on behalf of the research team by a Johannesburg-based research company called *Progressus*. The telephone surveys were conducted between 17 November and 14 December 2012; a pilot telephone survey with a small sample of parents was conducted a week prior to this. *Progressus*, who have done similar work for other projects within the Centre for Social Science Research, was responsible for the recruitment and selection of the field workers as well as for the management and execution of the telephone interviews themselves. The UCT-based research team were therefore only responsible for designing the questionnaire, selecting the sample for the telephone interviews (as was discussed in a previous section), and providing general support to the *Progressus* project team.

Parent questionnaires were translated into Afrikaans and IsiXhosa as these are the two main additional languages spoken in the Cape Town area. These translations were done by the *Progressus* project team but were unfortunately not back-translated due to time constraints. Parents were also required to give verbal consent prior to the start of their telephone interview. And as part of the verbal consent process, the parent/guardian also had to confirm that they were indeed the parent or guardian to a Grade 11 learner at the specified school. As such, the telephone interviewers introduced themselves as calling on behalf of a University of Cape Town research team and asked to speak to a parent of a grade 11 learner at the school in question. The interviewers had access to the name of the parent's child, but were instructed not to refer to the child by name unless there was ambiguity or the parent requested

confirmation of the child's name. In general, telephone interviews took approximately 10-15 minutes.

The Parent Questionnaire

The parent questionnaire was designed to be as similar as possible to the learner and teacher questionnaires while adapting it to a telephone format. Initial questions sought parents' opinions on their children's school as well as democracy/citizenship education before asking them for their opinions on public affairs more generally. The final questions were demographic in nature.

Survey Completion Rates

Additionally, interviewers were also instructed to make 4 attempted calls to a parent/guardian before replacing that parent/guardian. Overall, survey completion rates for the parent telephone interviews were as follows:

Table 3: Parent Survey Completion Rates

Complete interviews	1002
Incomplete interviews	13
Parent/ guardian not found or no answer	395
Wrong or invalid number	127
Language barrier	2
Refusal	24
Total in sample	1562

5. The Data Capturing Process

As part of the data capturing process, completed learner and teacher questionnaires were firstly scanned into a PDF format. Our three data capturers then made use of the open source QueXF computer-assisted data entry software to enter the data. The software was configured to allow only one option to be selected on multiple choice items, with the exception of items D2, D7, and D11 on the learner questionnaire and item C11 in the teacher questionnaire as a number of respondents made multiple selections for these items. These items therefore appear as dichotomous "Yes/No" variables in the final dataset.

Additionally, a subset of the surveys (N = 71) were entered twice via the QueXF system and the duplicate observations were compared using the Stata package “*cfout*”. From this process, it was established that there were 4.5 discrepancies for every 100 data points. These discrepancies were manually corrected. An additional sample of 180 questionnaires was subsequently manually checked and an error rate of approximately 0.02% was found. These errors were, once again, also manually corrected.

As has already been mentioned, the entirety of data from the classroom information forms and the school information forms have been entered into separate Excel spreadsheets and will be merged into the main dataset.

The Dataset

The project has produced five primary datasets, all of which have been thoroughly verified. These are:

- 1) The learner dataset, from the survey of learners;
- 2) The teacher dataset, from the survey of teachers;
- 3) The parent dataset, from the survey of parents;
- 4) The classroom information dataset, collected by the field workers during the survey administration process;
- 5) The school information dataset, collected by field team leaders during the fieldwork process.

Names and other individual identifying information has been removed from the learners, teacher and parent data and every effort has been made to ensure that this anonymity is maintained especially when the classroom information and school information are merged into the final dataset. Additionally, no post-coding has been conducted with open-ended questions in the teacher questionnaire; this can be conducted on a needs basis by individual researchers.

APPENDIX A (PART 2): CAS 2012 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

CODE BOOK

Question Number: schoolid

Question: School

Variable Label: School I.D.

Values: 1-51

Value Labels: Confidential

Question Number: classid

Question: Class

Variable Label: Classroom I.D.

Values: A, B, C, E, F, G

Value Labels: A= Life Orientation Class, B=History Class, C=Second Life Orientation Class, E= Second History Class, F= Afrikaans Language Class, G= English Language Class

Question Number: learnerid

Question: Learner

Variable Label: Learner I.D.

Values: String

Value Labels:

Question Number: surveyVersion

Question: ---

Variable Label: Survey Version Number

Values: 1-2

Value Labels: 1=Survey Version One, 2=Survey Version Two

Question Number: surveyLanguage

Question: ---

Variable Label: Survey Language

Values: E, A

Value Labels: E=English, A=Afrikaans

Question Number: totalAnswered

Question: ---

Variable Label: Total Number of Questions Answered

Values: String

Value Labels: ---

Question Number: birthmonth

Question: Date of Birth: Month

Variable Label: Birth Month

Values: 1-12; 99

Value Labels: 1=January, 2=February, 3=March, 4=April, 5=May, 6=June, 7=July, 8=August, 9=September, 10=October, 11=November, 12=December, 99=Missing

Question Number: birthyear

Question: Date of Birth: Year

Variable Label: Birth Year

Values: String; 99

Value Labels: 99=Missing

Question Number: a1

Question: A woman who has a young child is interviewed for a job at a travel agency. Which of the following is an example of discrimination? She does not get the job because...

Variable Label: a1. Test Question: Discrimination

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. she has no previous experience, 2=B. she is a mother, 3=C. she speaks only one language, 4=D. she demands a high salary, 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is B. she is a mother*

Question Number: a2

Question: In democratic countries what is the primary function of having more than one political party?

Variable Label: a2. Test Question: Multi-Party Democracy

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. To represent different opinions in the national legislature, 2=B. To limit political corruption, 3=C. To prevent political demonstrations, 4=D. To encourage economic competition, 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is A. To represent different opinions in the national legislature*

Question Number: a3

Question: Who is ultimately responsible for deciding whether a law is permitted under South Africa's Constitution?

Variable Label: a3. Test Question: Constitutional Decision Making

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. The President, 2=B. Parliament, 3=C. The courts, 4= D. Political Parties, 9=E. I don't know or I don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is C. The courts*

Question Number: a4

Question: The South African Constitutions Bill of Rights guarantees freedom of expression. Which of these is NOT protected by this freedom:

Variable Label: a4. Test Question: Bill of Rights Protection

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. The right of the citizen to criticize the President, 2=B. The right of a newspaper to publish information about corruption, 3=C. The right of a citizen to call for violence, 4=D. The right of a member of a political party to criticize that party, 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is C. The right of the citizen to call for violence*

Question Number: a5

Question: Which political party holds the most seats in South Africa's national legislature?

Variable Label: a5. Test Question: National Legislature Seats

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), 2=B. Democratic Alliance (DA), 3=C. African National Congress (ANC), 4=D. Congress of The People (COPE), 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is C. The African National Congress (ANC)*

Question Number: a6

Question: Which political party holds the most seats in the Western Cape Provincial Legislature?

Variable Label: a6. Test Question: WC Provincial Legislature Seats

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), 2=B. Democratic Alliance (DA), 3=C. African National Congress (ANC), 4=D. Congress of The People (COPE), 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is B. Democratic Alliance*

Question Number: a7

Question: Which if the following is most likely to mean that the country is no longer a democracy?

Variable Label: a7. Test Question: Non-Democratic Country

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. People are not allowed to criticise the government, 2=B. There are high levels of racism in society, 3=C. People pay very high taxes, 4=D. There is too much unemployment, 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is A. People are not allowed to criticise the government*

Question Number: a8

Question: Which of the following organisations created Apartheid?

Variable Label: a8. Test Question: Party Created Apartheid

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. United Democratic Front (UDF), 2=B. Pan-African Congress (PAC), 3=C. The National Party (NP), 4=D. The United Party (UP), 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is C. The National Party*

Question Number: a9

Question: The Sharpsville massacre in 1960 occurred in response to what?

Variable Label: a9. Test Question: Sharpsville Massacre

Values: 1-4, 9, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=A. Protests against the "pass laws", 2=B. Protests against the destruction of District Six, 3=C. An attack by the Mozambican military, 4=D. Conflict between black and white miners, 9=E. I don't know or don't have enough information, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

**Correct answer is A. Protests against the "pass laws"*

Question Number: b1a

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. a. Compared to my parents, I think I have better opportunities in life.

Variable Label: b1a. SA Today: Better Opportunities than Parents

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b1b

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. b. Anyone who works hard enough can get ahead in South Africa today.

Variable Label: b1b. SA Today: Hard Workers can get ahead

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b1c

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. c. South Africa should be proud of what it has achieved.

Variable Label: b1c. SA Today: Proud of what it has Achieved

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b1d

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. d. The people of South Africa have the ability to change the government if we don't like what it is doing

Variable Label: b1d. SA Today: People having the ability to change govt.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b1e

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. e. Corruption in South Africa's government is limited to a small number of individuals.

Variable Label: b1e. SA Today: Corruption limited to small no. of individuals.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b1f

Question: How do you see South Africa today? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements, and how strongly. f. When a person commits a crime in South Africa, they are generally punished.

Variable Label: b1f. SA Today: Criminals are punished

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b2a

Question: Please rate each of the following forms of government, from 0-10, where the worst form of governing a country gets a 0 and the best form of governing gets a 10. a. The way the country was governed under Apartheid.

Variable Label: b2a. Country Governed under Apartheid

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b2b

Question: Please rate each of the following forms of government, from 0-10, where the worst form of governing a country gets a 0 and the best form of governing gets a 10. b. Our current system of government with regular elections where everyone can vote and there are at least two political parties.

Variable Label: b2b. Current System with regular elections

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b2c

Question: Please rate each of the following forms of government, from 0-10, where the worst form of governing a country gets a 0 and the best form of governing gets a 10. c. The political system of South Africa as you expect it to be in 10 years time.

Variable Label: b2c. Political System expected: 10 years time.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disagree Strongly, 1=Disagree, 2=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree Strongly, 99=Missing

Question Number: b3a

Question: How much confidence do you have in each of the following people or institutions? a. The President of South Africa.

Variable Label: b3a. Confidence in people or institutions: President

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=No confidence, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Complete Confidence, 99=Missing

Question Number: b3b

Question: How much confidence do you have in each of the following people or institutions? The national government of South Africa

Variable Label: b3b. Confidence in people or institutions: National Govt.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=No confidence, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Complete Confidence, 99=Missing

Question Number: b3c

Question: How much confidence do you have in each of the following people or institutions? c. The provincial government of the Western Cape

Variable Label: b3c. Confidence in people or institutions: Western Cape Provincial Govt.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=No confidence, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Complete Confidence, 99=Missing

Question Number: b3d

Question: How much confidence do you have in each of the following people or institutions? The municipal government of Cape Town.

Variable Label: b3d. Confidence in people or institutions: Cape Town Municipal Govt.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=No confidence, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Complete Confidence, 99=Missing

Question Number: b3e

Question: How much confidence do you have in each of the following people or institutions? The police

Variable Label: b3e. Confidence in people or institutions: The Police

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=No confidence, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Complete Confidence, 99=Missing

Question Number: b4

Question: Overall, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in South Africa?

Variable Label: b4. Satisfaction with Democracy in SA

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all satisfied, 1=Not very satisfied, 2=Satisfied, 3=Very Satisfied, 99=Missing

Question Number: b5

Question: How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically? Please mark the appropriate box on this 0 to 10 scale.

Variable Label: b5. Importance of Democracy

Values: 0-10, 99

Value Labels: Scale, 99=Missing

Question Number: b6

Question: With which one of these statements are you most in agreement?

Variable Label: b6. Preference for Democracy

Values: 1-3, 99

Value Labels: 1=Democracy is preferable to any other kind of government, 2=In some circumstances, a non-democratic government can be preferable, 3=For someone like me, it doesn't matter what kind of government we have, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b7a

Question: There are many ways to govern a country. Would you disapprove or approve of the following alternatives in South Africa? a. Only one political party is allowed to stand for election and hold office.

Variable Label: b7a. Reject One-Party Rule

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b7b

Question: There are many ways to govern a country. Would you disapprove or approve of the following alternatives in South Africa? b. Elections and Parliament are abolished so that the president can decide everything.

Variable Label: b7b. Reject One-Man Rule

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b7c

Question: There are many ways to govern a country. Would you disapprove or approve of the following alternatives in South Africa? c. The army comes in to govern the country.

Variable Label: b7c. Reject Military Rule.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b7d

Question: There are many ways to govern a country. Would you disapprove or approve of the following alternatives in South Africa? d. If the country returned to the old system we had under Apartheid.

Variable Label: b7d. Reject Apartheid.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8a

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? a. Majority rule.

Variable Label: b8a. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Majority Rule.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8b

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? b. Complete freedom for anyone to criticise the government.

Variable Label: b8b. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Freedom of Expression.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8c

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? c. Regular elections

Variable Label: b8c. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Regular Elections.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8d

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? d. At least two political parties competing with each other.

Variable Label: b8d. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: At Least Two Parties Competing.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8e

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? e. Limits on the power of the government.

Variable Label: b8e. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Limits on Govt Power.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8f

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? f. Protections for the rights of minorities.

Variable Label: b8f. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Protection of Minorities.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8g

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? g. Equal treatment of men and women.

Variable Label: b8g. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Gender Equality

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8h

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? h. Basic necessities like shelter, food and water for everyone.

Variable Label: b8h. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Basic necessities for all.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b8i

Question: People associate democracy with many different meanings. What do you think? For a country to be called democratic, how important are each of the following in your opinion? i. A small income gap between rich and poor.

Variable Label: b8i. Essential Characteristics of Democracy: Small income gap between rich and poor.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all Important, 1=Not very Important, 2=Important, 3=Very Important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b9a

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of the past in South Africa today? a. People should realise we are South Africans first, and stop thinking of themselves in terms of the group they belong to.

Variable Label: b9a. SA society: Identify as South Africans first, not as groups.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b9b

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of the past in South Africa today? b. It might be better if South Africa's different population groups were allowed to develop separately.

Variable Label: b9b. SA society: Separate development of population groups.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b9c

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of the past in South Africa today? c. Most of the problems South Africa faces today can be traced to Apartheid.

Variable Label: b9c. SA society: Problems can be traced to Apartheid.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b9d

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of the past in South Africa today? d. In order to fix South Africa's problems we need to focus less on the past.

Variable Label: b9d. SA society: Focus less on the past.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b9e

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of the past in South Africa today? e. To make up for the past, people from groups hurt the most by Apartheid should get jobs before others.

Variable Label: b9e.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b10

Question: How interested are you in public affairs (politics and government)?

Variable Label: b10. Interest in public affairs.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not at all interested, 1=Not Very interested, 2=Somewhat Interested, 3=Very Interested, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b11a

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own understanding of politics? a. I am able to understand most political issues easily.

Variable Label: b11a. Able to understand most political issues.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b11b

Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own understanding of politics? b. I would be good at explaining a political issue to someone.

Variable Label: b11b. Good at explaining political issues.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: b12

Question: Is there any political party that you feel closer to than others. If so, which party?

Variable Label: b12. Support for Political Party

Values: 0-1, 97, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

Question Number: b12other

Question: Is there any political party that you feel closer to than others. If so, which party?

Variable Label: b12other. Which Party

Values: String; 99

Value Labels: 99=Missing

Question Number: b13a

Question: How often do you do the following things? a. Discuss politics or current events with people your own age.

Variable Label: b13a. How often, discuss politics with people own age.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13b

Question: How often do you do the following things? b. Discuss politics or current events with parents or other adult family members.

Variable Label: b13b. How often, discuss politics with parents or adult family.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13c

Question: How often do you do the following things? c. Read in the newspaper about what is happening in South Africa.

Variable Label: b13c. How often, read newspaper about SA.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13d

Question: How often do you do the following things? d. Watch the news on television.

Variable Label: b13d. How often, watch news on TV.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13e

Question: How often do you do the following things? e. Listen to news on the radio.

Variable Label: b13e. How often listen to news on radio.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13f

Question: How often do you do the following things? f. Read on the internet about news and politics.

Variable Label: b13f. How often, read news and politics on internet.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: b13g

Question: How often do you do the following things? g. Read about news or politics on social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, MXit).

Variable Label: b13g. How often, read news and politics on social media.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14a

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? a. Voting in every election.

Variable Label: bx14a. Importance as adult, voting in every election.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14b

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? b. Joining a political party or youth league.

Variable Label: bx14b. Importance as adult, joining pol.party.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14c

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? c. Participating in activities to benefit people in the local community.

Variable Label: bx14c. Importance as adult, participating in activities beneficial to local community.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14d

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? d. Taking part in activities to protect the environment.

Variable Label: bx14d. Importance as adult, protection of environment.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14e

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? e. Showing respect for government representatives.

Variable Label: bx14e. Importance as adult, respecting govt representatives.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14f

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? f. Engaging in political discussions.

Variable Label: bx14f. Importance as adult, engaging in political discussion

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14g

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? g. Not criticising the government

Variable Label: bx14g. Importance as adult, not criticising govt

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14h

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? h. Participating in peaceful protests against laws believed to be unjust.

Variable Label: bx14h. Importance as adult, peaceful protest against unjust laws.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14i

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? i. Agreeing with the majority of people in your community on political issues.

Variable Label: bx14i. Importance as adult, agreeing with majority on political issues.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx14j

Question: How important do you think the following behaviours will be for you to be a good citizen as an adult? j. Always obeying the law.

Variable Label: bx14j. Importance as adult, always obeying the law

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: bx15a

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? a. Volunteer time to help people in the community.

Variable Label: bx15a. Likelihood of volunteering in community.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15b

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? b. Vote in an election

Variable Label: bx15b. Likelihood of voting in election

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15c

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? c. Work for a party during an election campaign.

Variable Label: bx15c. Likelihood of working for pol. party election campaign.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15d

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? d. Contact an elected official during an election campaign.

Variable Label: bx15d. Likelihood of contacting elected official.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15e

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? e. Join with others to raise awareness of an important issue.

Variable Label: bx15e. Likelihood of contacting elected official

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15f

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? f. Write a letter to the editor or call in to a radio show about a public issue.

Variable Label: bx15f. Likelihood of writing to editor or calling about public issue.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15g

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? g. Participate in a peaceful protest march or rally.

Variable Label: bx15g. Likelihood of participating in peaceful protest.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15h

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? h. Block traffic as a form of protest.

Variable Label: bx15h. Likelihood of blocking traffic as protest.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: bx15i

Question: Listed Below are several types of actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years if you felt it was necessary to change something in your community. How likely would you be to do each of these things? i. Occupy public buildings as a form of protest

Variable Label: bx15i. Likelihood of occupying public buildings in protest.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=I would definitely NOT do this, 1=I would probably NOT do this, 2=I probably would do this, 3=I certainly would do this, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14a

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? a. Women should run for public office and take part in the government just as men do.

Variable Label: by14a. Women should run for public office.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14b

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? b. People should always be free to criticise the government publicly.

Variable Label: by14b. Freedom to criticise govt.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14c

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? c. When faced with threats to national security, the government should have the power to control what appears in the media.

Variable Label: by14c. Govt should have the power to control media in the case of a national threat.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14d

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? d. When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women.

Variable Label: by14d. Men should have more rights to jobs than women.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14e

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? e. South Africa should allow less immigration from other countries.

Variable Label: by14e. SA should allow less immigration.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14f

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? f. More immigration means fewer jobs for South Africans.

Variable Label: by14f. More immigration means fewer jobs for SACans

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by14g

Question: We'd like to know more about what you think about some public issues. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? g. Immigration to South Africa should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyle.

Variable Label: by14g. Immigrants in SA can continue with their customs and lifestyle.

Values: 0-4, 98, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15a

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? a. Claiming government benefits to which one is not entitled.

Variable Label: by15a. Justifiable action, claiming unentitled benefits.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15b

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? b. Avoiding taxes.

Variable Label: by15b. Justifiable action, avoiding taxes.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15c

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? c. Offering a bribe to a public official.

Variable Label: by15c. Justifiable action, bribing public officials.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15d

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? d. Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.

Variable Label: by15d. Justifiable action, accepting bribes.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15e

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? e. A man beating his wife.

Variable Label: by15e. Justifiable action, man beating his wife.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15f

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? f. A parent smacking (klapping) their child.

Variable Label: by15f. Justifiable action, parent smacking child.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15g

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? g. Neighbours beating a person who stole from them.

Variable Label: by15g. Justifiable action, neighbours beating person who stole from them.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15h

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? h. Destroying public property as a form of protest.

Variable Label: by15h. Justifiable action, destroying public property in protest.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by15i

Question: Think about the actions below and when a person might have a reason that justifies taking them. How often do you think these actions are justified? i. Throwing rocks during a political protest.

Variable Label: by15i. Justifiable action, throwing rocks in protest.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never justified, 1=Rarely justified, 2=Sometimes justified, 3=Always justified, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by16

Question: Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that can't be too careful in dealing with people?

Variable Label: by16. Trust people in general.

Values: 1-2, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 1=Most people can be trusted, 2=Can't be too careful, 98=Not Applicable, 99=Missing

Question Number: by17a

Question: In general, how much do you trust the following groups of people? a. People from your neighbourhood.

Variable Label: by17a. Trust people in neighbourhood.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Not at all, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Completely, 98=Not applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by17b

Question: In general, how much do you trust the following groups of people? b. people from your racial or ethnic group.

Variable Label: by17b. Trust people in same racial/ethnic group.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Not at all, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Completely, 98=Not applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by17c

Question: In general, how much do you trust the following groups of people? c. Other South Africans in general.

Variable Label: by17c. Trust other South Africans.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Not at all, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Completely, 98=Not applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: by17d

Question: In general, how much do you trust the following groups of people? d. People from other countries living here.

Variable Label: by17d. Trust immigrants.

Values: 0-3, 98, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Not at all, 1=A little, 2=Quite a lot, 3=Completely, 98=Not applicable, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c1a

Question: When discussing political and social issues during regular lessons, how often do the following things happen? a. Teachers encourage students to make up their own minds.

Variable Label: c1a. Teachers encourage students to make up own minds.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c1b

Question: When discussing political and social issues during regular lessons, how often do the following things happen? b. Students can disagree with teachers as long as they are respectful.

Variable Label: c1b. Students can respectfully disagree with teachers.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c1c

Question: When discussing political and social issues during regular lessons, how often do the following things happen? c. Teachers present several sides of the issues when explaining them.

Variable Label: c1c. Teachers present several sides of issue.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c1d

Question: When discussing political and social issues during regular lessons, how often do the following things happen? d. Students bring up current political events for discussion.

Variable Label: c1d. Students bring up current pol. events.

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c2a

Question: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about you and your school? Think about life at your school in general, not any specific class. a. Most students seem to care about each other, even people they don't know at all.

Variable Label: c2a. In school, most students care for all.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c2b

Question: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about you and your school? Think about life at your school in general, not any specific class. b. Teachers don't let students make fun of other students.

Variable Label: c2b. In school, teachers discourage making fun of others.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c2c

Question: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about you and your school? Think about life at your school in general, not any specific class. c. Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say.

Variable Label: c2c. In school, most teachers listen.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c2d

Question: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about you and your school? Think about life at your school in general, not any specific class. d. Teachers give all students a fair chance.

Variable Label: c2d. In school, teachers give students a fair chance.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c2e

Question: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about you and your school? Think about life at your school in general, not any specific class. e. Students have a role in making decisions in the school.

Variable Label: c2e. In school, students play a decision-making role.

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=Disapprove Strongly, 1=Disapprove, 2=Neither Approve nor Disapprove, 3=Approve, 4=Strongly Approve, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c3

Question: So far this year, about how much of class time in your Life Orientation class would you say is spent on issues related to civics, citizenship, history or human rights?

Variable Label: c3. How much class time spent in Life Orientation on civics, citizenship, history or human rights.

Values: 0-3, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Less than 25%, 1=Between 25% and 49%, 2=Between 50% and 74%, 3=75% or more, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c4

Question: Are you taking History as a subject this year?

Variable Label: c4. Taking History as a subject

Values: 0-1, 97, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c5a

Question: How often do you talk about current events, politics and government in the following subject areas? a. Life Orientation.

Variable Label: c5a. How often, talk about current events, politics and govt in Life Orientation

Values: 0-3, 9, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 9=I am not taking this subject, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c5b

Question: How often do you talk about current events, politics and government in the following subject areas? b. History/Geography.

Variable Label: c5b. How often, talk about current events, politics and govt in History/Geography.

Values: 0-3, 9, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 9=I am not taking this subject, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c5c

Question: How often do you talk about current events, politics and government in the following subject areas? c. Business/Economics.

Variable Label: c5c. How often, talk about current events, politics and govt in Business/Economics

Values: 0-3, 9, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 9=I am not taking this subject, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c5d

Question: How often do you talk about current events, politics and government in the following subject areas? d. Other subjects.

Variable Label: c5d. How often, talk about current events, politics and govt in other subjects

Values: 0-3, 9, 99

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 9=I am not taking this subject, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c6a

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? a. CLASI (Constitutional Literacy and Service Initiative) civic education.

Variable Label: c6a. Have participated in: CLASI civic education

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6b

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? b. "Street Law" civic education.

Variable Label: c6b. Have participated in: "Street Law" civic education

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6c

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? c. "Facing Our History and Ourselves" history education.

Variable Label: c6c. Have participated in: "Facing our history and ourselves" history education

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6d

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? d. A visit to the Holocaust Centre in downtown Cape Town.

Variable Label: c6d. Have participated in: Visit to Holocaust Museum

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6e

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? e. A visit to Robben Island.

Variable Label: c6e. Have participated in: Visit to Robben Island

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6f

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? f. A visit to Parliament.

Variable Label: c6f. Have participated in: Visit to Parliament

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c6g

Question: Have you participated in the following activities? g. A visit to the District Six Museum.

Variable Label: c6g. Have participated in: Visit to District Six Museum

Values: 0-1, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: c7a

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? The Representative Council of Learners.

Variable Label: c7a. Involved in: Represented Council of Learners

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7b

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? b. The School Governing Body.

Variable Label: c7b. Involved in: School Governing Body

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7c

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? c. Any other school committee.

Variable Label: c7c. Involved in: Other school committee

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7d

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? d. A sports team.

Variable Label: c7d. Involved in: A sports team

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7e

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? A school club or society.

Variable Label: c7e. Involved in: School club or committee

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7f

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? A religious group

Variable Label: c7f. Involved in: A religious group

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: c7g

Question: In the past year, have you participated in the following activities, and do you think you were an inactive member, an active member or a leader of the group? g. An arts project, club or society (for example theatre, music).

Variable Label: c7g. Involved in: Arts project, club or society

Values: 1-4, 97, 99

Value Labels: 1=I am not involved in this, 2=Inactive Member, 3=Active Member, 4=Leader, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d1

Question: Are you male or female?

Variable Label: d1. Gender

Values: 1-2, 99
Value Labels: 1=Male, 2=Female, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_xhosa
Question: What language do you speak at home? Xhosa
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Xhosa
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_afrikaans
Question: What language do you speak at home? Afrikaans
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Afrikaans
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_english
Question: What language do you speak at home? English
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: English
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_zulu
Question: What language do you speak at home? Zulu
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Zulu
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_sotho
Question: What language do you speak at home? Sotho
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Sotho
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_tswana
Question: What language do you speak at home? Tswana
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Tswana
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2_otherLanguage
Question: What language do you speak at home? Other
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Other
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d2other
Question: What language do you speak at home? Other Verbatim
Variable Label: d2. Language of Respondent: Other verbatim
Values: String
Value Labels:---

Question Number: d3
Question: Where were you born?
Variable Label: d3. Where respondent was born
Values: 1-10, 99, 999
Value Labels: 1=Cape Town, 2=Western Cape, but outside Cape Town, 3=Eastern Cape, 4=Free State, 5=Gauteng, 6=KwaZulu-Natal, 7=Limpopo, 8=Mpumalanga, 9=North West, 10=Northern Cape, 99=Another country, 999=Missing.

Question Number: d3other

Question: Where were you born? Verbatim
Variable Label: d3. Where respondent was born, other verbatim
Values: String
Value Labels:---

Question Number: d4
Question: What is the highest level of education you intend to complete?
Variable Label: d4. Highest expected level of education
Values: 1-4, 99
Value Labels: 1=Grade 11, 2=Grade 12/Matric, 3=Technical University/Technikon, 4=University, 99=Missing

Question Number: d5
Question: After you complete all your education, how difficult do you think it will be to find a job?
Variable Label: d5. Ease to find job once education completed
Values: 0-3, 99
Value Labels: 0=Not difficult at all, 1=Not very difficult, 2=Difficult, 3=Very difficult, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d6
Question: Compared to other learners your age, do you think you are academically:
Variable Label: d6. Self-compared academic ability
Values: 0-3, 99.
Value Labels: 0=A weak student, 1=About average, 2=A strong student, 3=A very strong student, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d7_african
Question: What is your population group? African/Black
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: Black
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d7_coloured
Question: What is your population group? Coloured
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: Coloured
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d7_indian
Question: What is your population group? Indian/Asian
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: Indian/Asian
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d7_white
Question: What is your population group? White
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: White
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d7_other
Question: What is your population group? Other
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: Other
Values: 0-1, 99
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d7other
Question: What is your population group? Other verbatim
Variable Label: d7. Race of respondent: Other verbatim
Values: String
Value Labels: ---

Question Number: d8a

Question: And how important would you say that being in this population group is for... a. your own sense of identity.

Variable Label: d8a. Importance of population group to own identity

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d8b

Question: And how important would you say that being in this population group is for... b. the way you think about politics and citizenship.

Variable Label: d8b. Importance of population group to way you think of politics

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d8c

Question: And how important would you say that being in this population group is for... c. how others see you.

Variable Label: d8c. Importance of population group to how others see you

Values: 0-3, 99

Value Labels: 0=Not important at all, 1=Not very important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Very important, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d9

Question: Do you think being a member of this population group affects your opportunities in life? Would you say that being in this population group gives you more opportunities or less opportunities compared to other groups, or it doesn't matter?

Variable Label: d9. Does being a member of this population group affect opportunities received

Values: 0-4, 99

Value Labels: 0=A lot less opportunities, 1=Somewhat less opportunities, 2=Doesn't matter at all, 3=Somewhat more opportunities, 4=A lot more opportunities, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d10a

Question: Do any of these people live with you most or all of the time? Mother or stepmother or female guardian.

Variable Label: d10a. Do the following live at your home: Mother, stepmother, female guardian

Values: 0-1, 97, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

Question Number: d10b

Question: Do any of these people live with you most or all of the time? Father or stepfather or male guardian

Variable Label: d10b. Do the following live at your home: Father, step father, male guardian

Values: 0-1, 97, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

Question Number: d10c

Question: Do any of these people live with you most or all of the time? Grandparent

Variable Label: d10c. Do the following live at your home: Grandparent

Values: 0-1, 97, 99

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 97=Two Responses Selected, 99=Missing

Question Number: d11a_1

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Self-employed/own business.

Variable Label: d11a_1. Father/Male Guardian: Self-Employed/Own Business

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_2

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Working full-time.

Variable Label: d11a_2. Father/Male Guardian: Working Full-time

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_3

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Working part-time/contract/casual/seasonal work.

Variable Label: d11a_3. Father/Male Guardian: Working Part-time/Contract/Casual/Seasonal work

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_4

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Unemployed

Variable Label: d11a_4. Father/Male Guardian: Unemployed

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_5

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Student

Variable Label: d11a_5. Father/Male Guardian: Student

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_6

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Disabled or receiving a disability grant.

Variable Label: d11a_6. Father/Male Guardian: Disabled or receiving disability grant

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_7

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Retired/Pensioner

Variable Label: d11a_7. Father/Male Guardian: Retired/Pensioner

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_8

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Homemaker.

Variable Label: d11a_8. Father/Male Guardian: Homemaker

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_9

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Deceased.

Variable Label: d11a_9. Father/Male Guardian: Deceased

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11a_10

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Father or male guardian: Don't know.

Variable Label: d11a_10. Father/Male Guardian: Don't know

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_1

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Self-employed/own business.

Variable Label: d11b_1. Mother/Female Guardian: Self-Employed/Own Business

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_2

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Working full-time.

Variable Label: d11b_2. Mother/Female Guardian: Working Full-time

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_3

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Working part-time/contract/casual/seasonal work.

Variable Label: d11b_3. Mother/Female Guardian: Working Part-Time/Contract/Casual/Seasonal work

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_4

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Unemployed

Variable Label: d11b_4. Mother/Female Guardian: Unemployed

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_5

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Student.

Variable Label: d11b_5. Mother/Female Guardian: Student

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_6

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Disabled or receiving a disability grant.

Variable Label: d11b_6. Mother/Female Guardian: Disabled or receiving a disability grant

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_7

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Retired/pensioner

Variable Label: d11b_7. Mother/Female Guardian: Retired/pensioner

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_8

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Homemaker

Variable Label: d11b_8. Mother/Female Guardian: Homemaker

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_9

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Deceased

Variable Label: d11b_9. Mother/Female Guardian: Deceased

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d11b_10

Question: Thinking about your parents(s) or guardian(s), what best describes their current occupation(s)? Mother or female guardian: Don't know

Variable Label: d11b_10. Mother/Female Guardian: Don't Know

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12a

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... a. Felt unsafe in the street.

Variable Label: d12a. How often, felt unsafe in street

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12b

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... b. Felt unsafe in school.

Variable Label: d12b. How often, felt unsafe in school

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12c

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... c. Felt unsafe in your home.

Variable Label: d12c. How often, felt unsafe in home

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12d

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... d. Worried that your family does not have enough money.

Variable Label: d12d. How often, worried about family having enough money

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12e

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... e. Worried that you or someone in your family will suffer serious illness.

Variable Label: d12e. How often, worried about serious illness suffered by self or family

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d12f

Question: Over the past year, how often have you... f. Gone without electricity in your home (not including load-shedding).

Variable Label: d12f. How often, gone without electricity

Values: 0-4, 99.

Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Just once or twice, 2=Several times, 3=Many times, 4=Always, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d13a

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: a. TV set.

Variable Label: d13a. In household: TV set

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13b

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: b. Car, bakkie or other passenger vehicle.

Variable Label: d13b. In household: Car, bakkie, other passenger vehicle

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13c

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: c. M-Net/DStv subscription at home.

Variable Label: d13c. In household: M-Net/DSTV

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13d

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: d. Radio/Hi-fi/music centre.

Variable Label: d13d. In household: Radio/Hi-Fi/Music centre

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13e

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: e. Computer

Variable Label: d13e. In household: Computer

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13f

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: f. Dish washing machine.

Variable Label: d13f. In household: Dish washing machine

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13g

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: g. Washing machine.

Variable Label: d13g. In household: Washing machine

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13h

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: h. Electric stove

Variable Label: d13h. In household: Electric Stove

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13i

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: i. Fridge/freezer

Variable Label: d13i. In household: Fridge/freezer

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13j

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: j. Home security service (burglar alarm or armed response).

Variable Label: d13j. In household: Home security service

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13k

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: k. Tap water in house/on plot.

Variable Label: d13k. In household: Tap in house/on plot

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13l

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: l. Hot running water

Variable Label: d13l. In household: Hot running water

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d13m

Question: We'd like to understand a little more about your lifestyle. Please tell me which of the following are presently in your household: m. Flush toilet in/outside house.

Variable Label: d13m. In household: Flush toilet in/outside house

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d14a

Question: Do you have: a. Your own (personal)mobile phone.

Variable Label: d14a. Has own phone

Values: 0-1, , 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d14b

Question: Do you have: b. Access to the internet at home.

Variable Label: d14b. Has access to internet at home

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d14c

Question: Do you have: c. Access to the internet at school.

Variable Label: d14c.Has access to internet at school

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d14d

Question: Do you have: Access to the internet somewhere in your neighbourhood (in a library, internet café, etc.).

Variable Label: d14d. Has access to internet in neighbourhood

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d14e

Question: Do you have: Access to the internet on your own mobile phone.

Variable Label: d14e. Has access to internet on phone

Values: 0-1, 99.

Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d15
Question: Does your family employ a domestic worker?
Variable Label: d15. Has a domestic worker
Values: 0-1, 99.
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d16
Question: Do you have a child?
Variable Label: d16. Has a child
Values: 0-1, 99.
Value Labels: 0=No, 1=Yes, 99=Missing

Question Number: d17
Question: Apart from wedding and funerals, about how often do you attend religious services these days?
Variable Label: d17. Attends religious services
Values: 0-4, 99
Value Labels: 0=Never, almost never, 1=Once or twice a year, 2=Once or twice a month, 3=Once a week, 4=More than once a week, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d18
Question: At home, with your family, how much influence do you feel you have in family decisions that affect you?
Variable Label: d18. Influence in family decisions
Values: 0-3, 99.
Value Labels: 0=No influence, 1=A little influence, 2=Some influence, 3=A great deal of influence, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d19
Question: At home, with your family, when a decision is made that you don't like, what statement best describes how you feel?
Variable Label: d19. Discussion of disagreement with family-made decisions
Values: 1-3, 99.
Value Labels: 1=I feel free to discuss the decision with my parent or guardian, 2=I feel uneasy discussing the decision with my parents or guardian, 3=I think it is better not to discuss such things with my parents or guardian, 99=Missing.

Question Number: d20
Question: When a decision you don't like is made at home, how often do you discuss it with your parents or guardian?
Variable Label: d20. How often, discuss disagreement with family decisions
Values: 0-3, 99
Value Labels: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 99=Missing.

APPENDIX A (PART 3): CAS 2012 SCHOOL FORM

School Name: _____

School Code: _____

Field Coordinator ID: _____

School Information Form

1. How many learners are there in the school?

2. How many learners are there in Grade 11?

3. How many of these Grade 11 learners take History as a subject (if applicable)?

4. How long are the class periods at this school?

30 – 39 minutes ☐

40 – 49 minutes ☐

> 50 minutes ☐

5. How many full-time teachers are employed at the school?

6. On an average day, how many teachers are present to teach (i.e. not absent)?

7. How long has the current school principal been in the job?

8. Does the school have a functioning School Governing Body?

No ☐

Yes ☐

9. How many full-time teachers are supported by the School Governing Body?

10. How many people are on the School Governing body?

1. Learners: _____

2. Parents: _____

3. School Officials (Principle/Teachers): _____

11. How often does the School Governing Body meet?

12. Does your school have a Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)?

No ☐

Yes ☐

13. If yes, how often does the PTA interact with the school?

14. How often have the Western Cape Education Department's School Inspectors visited the school this year?

Never, not once this year ☐

A couple of times ☐ (Write down how many times: _____)

15. Did you find that (Please tick):

A. School Officials were	Cooperative	In between	Uncooperative
B. School Secretary was	Friendly	In between	Unfriendly
C. School Secretary was	Helpful	In between	Unhelpful
D. School Secretary was	Overburdened/Hurried	In between	Calm and Collected
E. Learners were	Well-Supervised	In between	Unsupervised
F. Learners were	Well-Controlled	In between	Uncontrolled
G. Class Periods	Started on Time	In between	Started Late
H. The Classroom Furniture (Desks, Chairs)	Well Cared For	In between	Run-down and Broken
i. The School/Administration Office was	Well-Resourced	In between	Under-Resourced
J. The School Grounds and Buildings were	Well Cared For	In between	Run-down and Broken
K. Toilet Facilities for Learners were	Well Cared For	In between	Run-down and Broken
L The Overall Cleanliness of the School was	Very Good	In between	Not Very Good

16. Were the noises levels on the school premises:

Reasonable ☐

We had to Raise Our Voices to Hear Each Other ☐

17. Would you say that

The school has access to electricity and all areas of the school are well-lit ☐

The school has access to electricity but there are areas of the school that are badly lit ☐

The school had no access to electricity on the day of the survey

☐

18. Would you describe the area surrounding the school as:

Residential ☐

Rural ☐

Business District ☐

19. Would you describe the houses in the area surrounding the school as:

Formal Housing ☐

Informal Housing ☐

Non-applicable ☐

20. Was the road directly leading to the school paved/tarred/concrete?

No ☐

Yes ☐

21. Did the school have a private security guard?

No ☐

Yes ☐

22. In the area surrounding the school, did you (or any of your field workers) see policemen/SAPS vehicles?

No ☐

Yes ☐

23. Were there any incidents/events of concern? Please describe in detail:

24. Did the school have it's own procedure for obtaining parental consent prior to the administration of the questionnaire? If yes, please elaborate on this process [*Please collect the completed consent forms from the school principle and return them to Samantha Richmond*]

Any other observations and/or comments:

APPENDIX B: VARIABLES - FACTOR AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS & ANOVA

ANOVA								
				Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
School Level Political Knowledge	Between Groups	(Combined)		852.178	4	213.045	434.379	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	623.716	1	623.716	1271.701	.000
			Weighted	660.640	1	660.640	1346.987	.000
			Deviation	191.538	3	63.846	130.176	.000
	Within Groups			1229.087	2506	.490		
	Total			2081.266	2510			
School Level Bureaucratic Efficiency	Between Groups	(Combined)		120.547	4	30.137	192.571	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	1.159	1	1.159	7.403	.007
			Weighted	1.142	1	1.142	7.299	.007
			Deviation	119.405	3	39.802	254.329	.000
	Within Groups			392.180	2506	.156		
	Total			512.727	2510			
School Level Participation in School Organisations	Between Groups	(Combined)		50.779	4	12.695	591.535	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	25.992	1	25.992	1211.151	.000
			Weighted	23.538	1	23.538	1096.816	.000
			Deviation	27.241	3	9.080	423.109	.000
	Within Groups			53.781	2506	.021		
	Total			104.560	2510			
School Level Students Play Decision-Making	Between Groups	(Combined)		28.000	4	7.000	165.037	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	22.187	1	22.187	523.109	.000
			Weighted	18.638	1	18.638	439.436	.000
			Deviation	9.361	3	3.120	73.570	.000
	Within Groups			106.290	2506	.042		
	Total			134.289	2510			
School Level Environment Caring and Fair	Between Groups	(Combined)		60.000	4	15.000	423.727	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	35.695	1	35.695	1008.329	.000
			Weighted	38.518	1	38.518	1088.074	.000
			Deviation	21.482	3	7.161	202.277	.000
	Within Groups			88.713	2506	.035		
	Total			148.712	2510			
School Level Classroom Climate	Between Groups	(Combined)		11.189	4	2.797	224.747	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	9.752	1	9.752	783.489	.000
			Weighted	10.484	1	10.484	842.302	.000
			Deviation	.706	3	.235	18.895	.000
	Within Groups			31.191	2506	.012		
	Total			42.380	2510			
School Level Frequency Political Discussion	Between Groups	(Combined)		45.844	4	11.461	23.335	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	5.427	1	5.427	11.050	.001
			Weighted	6.730	1	6.730	13.702	.000
			Deviation	39.114	3	13.038	26.546	.000
	Within Groups			1230.833	2506	.491		
	Total			1276.677	2510			
School Level Students Raise Politics in Class	Between Groups	(Combined)		16.179	4	4.045	92.093	.000
		Linear Term	Unweighted	1.928	1	1.928	43.892	.000
			Weighted	.925	1	.925	21.050	.000
			Deviation	15.255	3	5.085	115.774	.000
	Within Groups			110.065	2506	.044		
	Total			126.244	2510			

Multiple Comparisons							
LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) School By Previous/Current Administration	(J) School By Previous/Current Administration	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
School Level Political Knowledge	CED (Prev White)	Independent	-.19335 [*]	.05059	.000	-.2926	-.0942
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	1.05160 [*]	.03638	.000	.9803	1.1229
		DET (Prev Black)	1.24421 [*]	.04575	.000	1.1545	1.3339
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	1.26506 [*]	.04823	.000	1.1705	1.3596
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	.19335 [*]	.05059	.000	.0942	.2926
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	1.24495 [*]	.04802	.000	1.1508	1.3391
		DET (Prev Black)	1.43756 [*]	.05545	.000	1.3288	1.5463
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	1.45841 [*]	.05752	.000	1.3456	1.5712
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	-1.05160 [*]	.03638	.000	-1.1229	-.9803
		Independent	-1.24495 [*]	.04802	.000	-1.3391	-1.1508
		DET (Prev Black)	.19261 [*]	.04289	.000	.1085	.2767
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.21346 [*]	.04552	.000	.1242	.3027
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	-1.24421 [*]	.04575	.000	-1.3339	-1.1545
		Independent	-1.43756 [*]	.05545	.000	-1.5463	-1.3288
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.19261 [*]	.04289	.000	-.2767	-.1085
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.02085	.05331	.696	-.0837	.1254
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	-1.26506 [*]	.04823	.000	-1.3596	-1.1705
		Independent	-1.45841 [*]	.05752	.000	-1.5712	-1.3456
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.21346 [*]	.04552	.000	-.3027	-.1242
		DET (Prev Black)	-.02085	.05331	.696	-.1254	.0837
School Level Bureaucratic Efficiency	CED (Prev White)	Independent	.57999 [*]	.02858	.000	.5240	.6360
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.04646 [*]	.02055	.024	.0062	.0868
		DET (Prev Black)	.45854 [*]	.02584	.000	.4079	.5092
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.02477	.02724	.363	-.0782	.0287
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	-.57999 [*]	.02858	.000	-.6360	-.5240
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.53353 [*]	.02712	.000	-.5867	-.4803
		DET (Prev Black)	-.12146 [*]	.03132	.000	-.1829	-.0600
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.60476 [*]	.03249	.000	-.6685	-.5411
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	-.04646 [*]	.02055	.024	-.0868	-.0062
		Independent	.53353 [*]	.02712	.000	.4803	.5867
		DET (Prev Black)	.41208 [*]	.02423	.000	.3646	.4596
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.07123 [*]	.02571	.006	-.1217	-.0208
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	-.45854 [*]	.02584	.000	-.5092	-.4079
		Independent	.12146 [*]	.03132	.000	.0600	.1829
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.41208 [*]	.02423	.000	-.4596	-.3646
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.48331 [*]	.03011	.000	-.5424	-.4243
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.02477	.02724	.363	-.0287	.0782
		Independent	.60476 [*]	.03249	.000	.5411	.6685
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.07123 [*]	.02571	.006	.0208	.1217
		DET (Prev Black)	.48331 [*]	.03011	.000	.4243	.5424
School Level Participation in School Organisations	CED (Prev White)	Independent	-.14640 [*]	.01058	.000	-.1672	-.1256
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.03350 [*]	.00761	.000	.0186	.0484
		DET (Prev Black)	-.21222 [*]	.00957	.000	-.2310	-.1935
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.37207 [*]	.01009	.000	-.3919	-.3523
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	.14640 [*]	.01058	.000	.1256	.1672
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.17990 [*]	.01004	.000	.1602	.1996
		DET (Prev Black)	-.06582 [*]	.01160	.000	-.0886	-.0431

		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.22567	.01203	.000	-.2493	-.2021
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	-.03350	.00761	.000	-.0484	-.0186
		Independent	-.17990	.01004	.000	-.1996	-.1602
		DET (Prev Black)	-.24572	.00897	.000	-.2633	-.2281
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.40557	.00952	.000	-.4242	-.3869
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	.21222	.00957	.000	.1935	.2310
		Independent	.06582	.01160	.000	.0431	.0886
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.24572	.00897	.000	.2281	.2633
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.15985	.01115	.000	-.1817	-.1380
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.37207	.01009	.000	.3523	.3919
		Independent	.22567	.01203	.000	.2021	.2493
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.40557	.00952	.000	.3869	.4242
		DET (Prev Black)	.15985	.01115	.000	.1380	.1817
School Level Students Play Decision-Making	CED (Prev White)	Independent	.12721	.01488	.000	.0980	.1564
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.08019	.01070	.000	-.1012	-.0592
		DET (Prev Black)	-.22310	.01345	.000	-.2495	-.1967
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.19901	.01418	.000	-.2268	-.1712
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	-.12721	.01488	.000	-.1564	-.0980
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.20740	.01412	.000	-.2351	-.1797
		DET (Prev Black)	-.35031	.01631	.000	-.3823	-.3183
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.32622	.01691	.000	-.3594	-.2931
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	.08019	.01070	.000	.0592	.1012
		Independent	.20740	.01412	.000	.1797	.2351
		DET (Prev Black)	-.14290	.01261	.000	-.1676	-.1182
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.11882	.01339	.000	-.1451	-.0926
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	.22310	.01345	.000	.1967	.2495
		Independent	.35031	.01631	.000	.3183	.3823
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.14290	.01261	.000	.1182	.1676
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.02409	.01568	.125	-.0067	.0548
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.19901	.01418	.000	.1712	.2268
		Independent	.32622	.01691	.000	.2931	.3594
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.11882	.01339	.000	.0926	.1451
		DET (Prev Black)	-.02409	.01568	.125	-.0548	.0067
School Level Environment Caring and Fair	CED (Prev White)	Independent	-.22882	.01359	.000	-.2555	-.2022
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.05758	.00977	.000	-.0767	-.0384
		DET (Prev Black)	-.33631	.01229	.000	-.3604	-.3122
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.42084	.01296	.000	-.4462	-.3954
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	.22882	.01359	.000	.2022	.2555
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.17124	.01290	.000	.1459	.1965
		DET (Prev Black)	-.10749	.01490	.000	-.1367	-.0783
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.19202	.01545	.000	-.2223	-.1617
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	.05758	.00977	.000	.0384	.0767
		Independent	-.17124	.01290	.000	-.1965	-.1459
		DET (Prev Black)	-.27873	.01152	.000	-.3013	-.2561
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.36326	.01223	.000	-.3872	-.3393
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	.33631	.01229	.000	.3122	.3604
		Independent	.10749	.01490	.000	.0783	.1367
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.27873	.01152	.000	.2561	.3013
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.08453	.01432	.000	-.1126	-.0564
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.42084	.01296	.000	.3954	.4462
		Independent	.19202	.01545	.000	.1617	.2223

	schools)	HOR (Prev Coloured)	.36326	.01223	.000	.3393	.3872
		DET (Prev Black)	.08453	.01432	.000	.0564	.1126
School Level Classroom Climate	CED (Prev White)	Independent	.05752	.00806	.000	.0417	.0733
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.07420	.00580	.000	.0628	.0856
		DET (Prev Black)	.17097	.00729	.000	.1567	.1853
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.19133	.00768	.000	.1763	.2064
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	-.05752	.00806	.000	-.0733	-.0417
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.01668	.00765	.029	.0017	.0317
		DET (Prev Black)	.11345	.00883	.000	.0961	.1308
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.13381	.00916	.000	.1158	.1518
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	-.07420	.00580	.000	-.0856	-.0628
		Independent	-.01668	.00765	.029	-.0317	-.0017
		DET (Prev Black)	.09678	.00683	.000	.0834	.1102
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.11713	.00725	.000	.1029	.1314
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	-.17097	.00729	.000	-.1853	-.1567
		Independent	-.11345	.00883	.000	-.1308	-.0961
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.09678	.00683	.000	-.1102	-.0834
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.02036	.00849	.017	.0037	.0370
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	-.19133	.00768	.000	-.2064	-.1763
		Independent	-.13381	.00916	.000	-.1518	-.1158
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.11713	.00725	.000	-.1314	-.1029
		DET (Prev Black)	-.02036	.00849	.017	-.0370	-.0037
School Level Frequency Political Discussion	CED (Prev White)	Independent	-.20385	.05062	.000	-.3031	-.1046
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.13536	.03640	.000	-.2067	-.0640
		DET (Prev Black)	.11099	.04578	.015	.0212	.2008
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.34248	.04826	.000	-.4371	-.2478
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	.20385	.05062	.000	.1046	.3031
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.06849	.04805	.154	-.0257	.1627
		DET (Prev Black)	.31484	.05549	.000	.2060	.4237
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.13863	.05756	.016	-.2515	-.0258
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	.13536	.03640	.000	.0640	.2067
		Independent	-.06849	.04805	.154	-.1627	.0257
		DET (Prev Black)	.24635	.04292	.000	.1622	.3305
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.20712	.04556	.000	-.2964	-.1178
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	-.11099	.04578	.015	-.2008	-.0212
		Independent	-.31484	.05549	.000	-.4237	-.2060
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.24635	.04292	.000	-.3305	-.1622
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.45346	.05335	.000	-.5581	-.3489
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.34248	.04826	.000	.2478	.4371
		Independent	.13863	.05756	.016	.0258	.2515
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.20712	.04556	.000	.1178	.2964
		DET (Prev Black)	.45346	.05335	.000	.3489	.5581
School Level Students Raise Politics in Class	CED (Prev White)	Independent	-.20736	.01514	.000	-.2370	-.1777
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.01485	.01089	.173	-.0065	.0362
		DET (Prev Black)	.09855	.01369	.000	.0717	.1254
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.04266	.01443	.003	-.0710	-.0144
	Independent	CED (Prev White)	.20736	.01514	.000	.1777	.2370
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.22220	.01437	.000	.1940	.2504
		DET (Prev Black)	.30591	.01659	.000	.2734	.3384
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	.16470	.01721	.000	.1309	.1984
	HOR (Prev Coloured)	CED (Prev White)	-.01485	.01089	.173	-.0362	.0065
		Independent	-.22220	.01437	.000	-.2504	-.1940

		DET (Prev Black)	.08370*	.01283	.000	.0585	.1089
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.05751*	.01362	.000	-.0842	-.0308
	DET (Prev Black)	CED (Prev White)	-.09855*	.01369	.000	-.1254	-.0717
		Independent	-.30591*	.01659	.000	-.3384	-.2734
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	-.08370*	.01283	.000	-.1089	-.0585
		WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	-.14121*	.01595	.000	-.1725	-.1099
	WCED (Post-94, mainly poor black schools)	CED (Prev White)	.04266*	.01443	.003	.0144	.0710
		Independent	-.16470*	.01721	.000	-.1984	-.1309
		HOR (Prev Coloured)	.05751*	.01362	.000	.0308	.0842
		DET (Prev Black)	.14121*	.01595	.000	.1099	.1725

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, P. & Inglehart, R. I. 1995. *Value Change in Global Perspective*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Almond, G. & Verba, S. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Alwin, D. F., Cohen, R. L., & Newcomb, T. M. 1991. *Political Attitudes Over The Life Span: The Bennington Women After 50 years*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Andolina, M. W., Jenkins, K., Zukin, C., & Keeter, S. 2003. Habits from Home, Lessons from School: Influences on Youth Civic Engagement. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36: 275-80.
- Audigier F. 2000. *Basic Concepts and Core Competencies for Education for Democratic Citizenship*. Strasburg: Council of Europe.
- Beetham, D. & Boyle, K. 1995. *Introducing Democracy: 80 Questions and Answers*. London: Polity Press/UNESCO.
- Biedermann, H., Shavelson, R. J. & Oser, F. 2008. Young People and Politics - Two Incompatible Worlds? Political Education and the Development of Aspects of Political Identity Among Young People. Unpublished paper presented at the AERA 2008 Annual Meeting, New York.
- Boehnke, K., Hagen, J. & Hefler, G. 1998. On the Development of Xenophobia in Germany: The Adolescent Years. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54: 585-602.
- Bratton, M. 2009. Democratic Attitudes and Political Participation: An Exploratory Comparison across World Regions. Unpublished paper presented at the Congress of the International Political Science Association, Santiago, Chile.
- Bratton, M., Mattes, R. & Gyimah-Boadi, E. 2005. *Public Opinion, Democracy and the Formation of Developmental Elites*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, D. 2006. 'What is Educations Impact on Civic and Social Engagement?'. Unpublished paper presented at the Symposium on Social Outcomes of Learning, Copenhagen, Denmark.

- Campbell, D. 2006. *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Campbell, D. 2008. Voice in the Classroom: How an Open Classroom Climate Fosters Political Engagement Among Adolescents. *Political Behaviour*, 30 (4): 437-454.
- Carrim, N. H. 2006. *Human Rights and the Construction of Identities in South African Education*. PhD Thesis, University of Witwatersrand.
- Chrisholm, L. 2001. Values, Multiculturalism and Human Rights in Apartheid and Post-Apartheid South African Curriculum. Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Values, Education and Democracy, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Chrisholm, L. 2004. *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Chrisholm, L. 2012. Apartheid Education: Legacies and New Directions in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Storia Delle Donne*, 8: 81-103.
- Chrisholm, L. 2012. The Challenge of South African Schooling: Dimensions, Targets and Initiatives. In J. Hofmeyr (ed.) *2011 Transformation Audit: From Inequality to Inclusive Growth*. Cape Town: Institute for Justice and Reconciliation.
- Christie, P. 1986. *The Right to Learn*. Johannesburg: Ravan.
- Christie, P. 1998. Schools as (Dis)organisations: The Breakdown of the Culture of Learning and Teaching in South African Schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28(3): 283-300.
- Christie, P. 2006. Changing Regimes: Governmentality and Education Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26: 373-381.
- Coetzee, C. 2014. Million Born-Frees Won't Vote May 7. *IOL*, 22 April. Available: <http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/million-born-frees-wont-vote-on-may-7-1678476> [Accessed: 2 May 2015].
- Conover, P. & Searing, D. 2000. A Political Socialisation Perspective. In L. M. McDonnell, P. M. Timpane, & R. Benjamin (eds.) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purpose of Education*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, 91-124.

- Conover, P. J. 1991. Political Socialization. In W. Crotty (ed.) *Political Science: Looking to the Future, Vol. III. Political Behaviour*. Evanston IL: Northwestern University Press, 125-152.
- Converse, P. E. & Dupeax, G. 1962. Politicization of the French electorate in France and the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 26: 1-23.
- Converse, P. E. 1972. Change in the American Electorate. In A. Campbell & P. E. Converse (eds.) *The Human Meaning of Social Change*. New York: Russell Sage, 263-337.
- Dalton, R. 1982. The Pathways of Parental Socialisation. *American Politics Quarterly*, 10: 139-57.
- Davies, L. 1999. Comparing Definitions of Democracy in education L. *Compare: A Journal if Comparative and International Education*. 29(2): 127-140.
- van der Berg, S., Burger, C., Burger, R., de Vos, M., du Rand, G., Gustafsson, M., Moses, E., Sheperd, D., Spaul, N., Taylor, S., van Broekhuizen, H. & von Fintel, D. 2011. *Low Education as a Poverty Trap*. Stellenbosch University: Department of Economics.
- De Groof, S., Elchardus, M., Franck, E. & Kavadis, D. 2008. The Influence of Civic Knowledge Versus Democratic School Experiences on Ethnic Tolerance of Adolescents: A Multilevel analysis. Unpublished paper presented at Youth and Politics: Strange Bedfellows? Comparative Perspectives on Political Socialization. Bruges.
- De Lange, J. P., Engelbrecht, S. W. H. & Taunyane, L. M. 1989. *Politics and Education*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Dennis, J. 1968. Major Problems of Political Socialization Research. *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 12(1): 85–114.
- Denver, D. & Hands, G. 1990. Does Studying Politics Make a Difference? The Political Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of School Students. *British Journal of Political Science*, 20 (2): 263-279.
- Department of Education, RSA. 1995. *White Paper on Education and Training*. Pretoria, Government Printers.

- Department of Education, RSA. 2001. *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy*. Pretoria, Government Printers.
- Dewey, J. 1916. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, Free Press.
- Easton, D. & Dennis, J. 1967. The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy. *American Political Science Review*, 61: 25–38.
- Easton, D. & Dennis, J. 1969. *Children in the Political System*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Easton, D. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Ehman, L. H. 1980. The American School in the Political Socialization Process. *Review of Educational Research*. 50(1): 99-119.
- Finchilescu, G. & Dawes, A. 1998. Catapulted Into Democracy: South African Adolescents' Socio-Political Orientations Following Rapid Social Change. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54: 563-83.
- Finkel, S. E. & Ernst, H. R. 2005. Civic Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Alternative Paths to the Development of Political Knowledge and Democratic Values. *Political Psychology*, 26: 333-64.
- Finkel, S. E. 1987. The Effects of Participation on Political Efficacy and Political Support: Evidence from a West German Panel. *Journal of Politics*, 49: 441-464.
- Finkel, S. E. 2002. Civic Education and the Mobilization of Political Participation in Developing Democracies. *Journal of Politics* 64: 994-1020.
- Finkel, S. E. 2003. Can Democracy Be Taught? *Journal of Democracy*, 14: 137-51.
- Fiske, E. & Ladd, H. 2004. *Exclusive Equity: Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Flanagan, C. A., Cumsille, P., Gill, S. & Galley, L. S. 2007. School and Community Climates and Civic Commitments: Patterns for Ethnic Minority and Majority Students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2): 421-431.
- Fleisch, B. 2008. *Primary Education in Crisis: Why South African School Children Underachieve in Reading and Mathematics*. Cape Tow: Juta & Co.

- Fourie, J. A. 2000. The Psychology of Perpetrators of 'Political' Violence in South Africa: A Personal Experience. *Ethnic Health*, 5 (3–4): 283–89.
- Friedman, S. 2014. Best of SACSIS: South Africa's Real Ticking Time Bomb- The Black Middle Class. *SACSIS*, 3 June. Available: <http://www.sacsis.org.za/site/article/2024> [Accessed: 22 April 2016].
- Friere, P. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Sheed & Ward.
- Galston, W. 2005. The Politics of Education. In S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (eds.) *The Public Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Galston, W. A. 2001. Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4: 217-34.
- Gimpel, J. G. & Lay, J. C. 2005. Party Identification, Local Partisan Contexts, and the Acquisition of Participatory Attitudes. In A. S. Zuckerman (ed.) *The Social Logic of Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gimpel, J. G., Lay, J. C. & Schuknecht, J. E. 2003. *Cultivating Democracy: Civic Environments and Political Socialization in America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Green, J. P. 2000. Review of R. G. Niemi and J. Junn 'Civic Education'. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81: 696-97.
- Greenstein, F. I. 1965. *Children and Politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Grix J. 2000. East German Political Attitudes: Socialist Legacies v. Situational Factors: A False Antithesis. *German Politics*, 9(2): 109–24.
- Harber, C. & Mncube, V. 2010. Chronicling Educator Practices and Experiences in the Context of Democratic Schooling and Quality Education in South Africa. *International Journal of educational Development*, 30: 614-624.
- Harber, C. & Mncube, V. 2012. Democracy, Education and Development: Theory and Reality. *Other Education: The Journal of Educational Alternatives*, 1(1): 104-120.
- Harber, C. 1997. International Developments and the Rise of Education for Democracy. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 27(2): 179-191.

- Harber, C. 2002. Education, Democracy and Poverty Reduction in Africa. *Comparative Education*, 38(3): 267-276.
- Harley, K. & Volker, W. 2004. Political Change, Curriculum Change and Social Formation, 1990-2002. In L. Chrishold (ed.) *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Hedtke, R. & Zimenkova, T. 2013. *Education for Civic and Political Participation: A Critical Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoadley, U. 2010. What do we know about teaching and learning in primary schools in South Africa? *Education as Change*, 16 (2): 187-202.
- Hyman, H. 1959. *Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Ichilov O. 2002. Differentiated Civics Curriculum and Patterns of Citizenship Education: Vocational and Academic Programs in Israel. In R. F. Faren (ed.) *Re-Conceptualising Politics, Socialisation and Education: International Perspectives for the Next Century*. Oldenberg, Germany: University of Oldenberg Press.
- Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernisation and Postmodernisation: Cultural, Economic, and*
- Inkeles, A. 1978. National Differences in Individual Modernity. *Comparative Studies in Sociology*, 1: 47-72.
- Inkeles, A. & Smith, D. 1976. *Becoming Modern*. London: Heinemann.
- Inkeles, A. 1969. Participant Citizenship in Six Developing Countries. *American Political Science Review*, 43: 1122-1133.
- Janse, J. & Blank, M. 2015. *How to Fix South African Schools: Lessons from Schools that Work*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bookstorm.
- Jansen, J. & Taylor, N. 2003. Educational Change in South Africa 1994-2003: Case Studies in Large Scale Education Reform. *Education Reform and Management Publication Series*, 2(1).
- Jansen, J. 1999. Why Outcomes-Based Education Will Fail: An Elaboration. In J. Jansen & P. Christie (eds.) *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*. Kenwyn: Juta.

- Jansen, J. 2001. Explaining Non-Change in Education Reform After Apartheid: Political Symbolism and the Problem of Policy Implementation. In J. Jansen & Y. Sayed (eds.) *Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Jennings M. K., Stoker L. & Bowers J. 2001. Politics Across Generations: Family Transmission Re-Examined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3): 782-299.
- Jennings M.K. & Niemi, R. G. 1981. *Generations and Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jennings, M. K. & Niemi, R. G. 1968. The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child. *American Political Science Review*, 62: 169-84.
- Jennings, M. K. & Niemi, R. G. 1974. *Political Character in Adolescence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jennings, M. K. & Stoker, L. 2002. Generational Change, Life Cycle Processes, and Social Capital. Presented at Citizenship on Trial: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Political Socialization of Adolescents, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Jennings, M. K. 1984. The Intergenerational Transfer of Political Ideology in Eight Western Nations. *European Journal of Political Research*, 12: 261-76.
- Karlsson, J. 2002. The Role of Democratic governing Bodies in South African Schools. *Comparative Education*, 38(2): 327-336.
- Keating, A., Benton, T. & Kerr, D. 2012. Evaluating the Impact of Citizenship Education in Schools: What Works and What Are We Measuring? In M. Print & D. Lange (eds.) *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Kendall, N. 2009 International Development Education. In R. Cowen & M. Kazamias (eds.) *International Handbook of Comparative Education*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Langton, K. & Jennings, M. K. 1968. Political Socialisation and the High School Civics Curriculum. *American Political Science Review*, 62: 852-67.
- Leftwich, A. 1996. *Democracy and Development*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Sharkey, V., Mayworm, A., Scacchi, L., Pastore, M. & Santinello, M. 2014. How School can Teach Civic Engagement Besides Civic

- Education: The Role of Democratic School Climate. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 54: 251-261.
- Mafora, P. 2013. Learners' and Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Leadership in Soweto Secondary Schools: A Social Justice Analysis. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3): 1-15.
- Mannheim, K. [1927] 1952. The Problem of Generations. In P. Keckemeti (ed.) *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marsh, A. & Kaase, M. 1979. Background of Political Action. In. S. H. Barnes & M. Kaase (eds.) *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Martinez-Herrera, E. 2002. From Nation-Building to Building Identification with Political Communities: Consequences of Political Decentralisation in Spain, the Basque Country, Catalonia and Galicia, 1978–2001. *European Journal of Political Research*, 41(4):421–53.
- Mattes, R. & Richmond, S. 2015. Are South Africa's Youth Really a 'Ticking Time Bomb'? Working Paper No. 152, Afrobarometer. Available: <http://afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/publications/Working%20paper/AfropaperNo152.pdf> [Accessed: February, 2015].
- Mattes, R. 2012. The 'Born Frees': The Prospects for Generational Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 47: 133-53.
- Mattes, R., Denemark, D. & Niemi, R. G. 2013. Learning Democracy? Civic education in South Africa's First Post-Apartheid Generation. Unpublished paper presented at the 7th General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research, France.
- Metz, E. & Youniss, J. 2005. Longitudinal Gains in Civic Development Through School-Based Required Service. *Political Psychology*, 26: 413-35.
- Milner, H. 2007. Political Knowledge and Political Participation Among Young Canadians and Americans. Working Paper 2007-01, Montreal: IRPP.
- Milner, H. 2002. *Civic Literacy: How Informed Citizens Make Democracy Work*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

- Mishler, W. & Rose, R. 2005. Generations, Aging, and Time: Patterns of Political Learning During Russia's Transformation. Unpublished paper presented at the 3rd ECPR General Conference, Budapest.
- Mncube, V. & Harber, C. 2013. Learners' Democratic Involvement in School Governing Bodies in South Africa: Making the Voice of the Voiceless Heard. *SA-eDUC*, 10(1): 1-24.
- Mncube, V. 2009. The Perceptions of Parents of Their Role in the Democratic Governance of Schools in South Africa: Are They on Board? *South African Journal of Education*. 29: 83-103.
- Morduchowicz, R., Catterberg, E., Niemi, R., & Bell, F. 1996. Teaching Political Science Knowledge and Democratic Values in a New Democracy: An Argentine Experiment. *Comparative Politics*, 28: 465-76.
- Morrow, W. 1986. *Chains of Thought*. Johannesburg: Southern Book.
- Vryonides, M. & Lampriarnou, I. 2013. Education and Social Stratification Across Europe. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 33: 77-97.
- Nelson Mandela Foundation. 2005. *Emerging Voices*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Nemi, R. G., Hepburn, M. A. & Chapman, C. 2000. Community Service by High School Students: A Cure for Civic Ills? *Political Behaviour*, 22: 45-69.
- Ngcobo, T. 2008. Key Dimensions of Effective Leadership for Change: A Focus on Township and Rural Schools in South Africa. Unpublished paper presented at the CCEAM Conference, *Think Globally Act Locally: A Challenge to Education Leaders*, Durban, South Africa.
- Nie, N. H., Junn, J. & Stehlik-Barry, K. 1996. *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Niemi, R. G. & Hepburn, M. 1995. The Rebirth of Political Socialization. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 24: 7-16.
- Niemi, R. G. & Junn, J. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Niemi, R. G. & Westholm, A. 1992. Political Institutions and Political Socialisation: A Cross-National Study. *Comparative Politics*, 25: 25-41.

- Niemi, R. J. & Chapman, C. 1996. *The Civic Development of 9th-Through 12th-Grade Students in the United State*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, National Centre for Education Statistics.
- Norris, P. 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- November, I., Alexander, G. & van Wyk, M. M. 2010. Do Principal-Educators Have the Ability to Transform Schools? A South African Perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26: 786-795.
- Percheron, A. & Jennings, M. K. 1981. Political Continuities in French Families: A New Perspective on an Old Controversy. *Comparative Politics*, 13: 421–36.
- Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, 1993;
- Putnam, R. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Quaynor, L. J. 2012. Citizenship Education in Post-Conflict Contexts: A Review of the Literature. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 7(1): 33-57.
- Raaijmakers, Q. A. W., Verbogt, T. F. M. A. & Vollebergh, W. A. M. 1998. Moral Reasoning and Political Beliefs of Dutch Adolescents and Young Adults. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54: 531-46.
- Renshon, S. 2003. Political Socialisation in a Divided Society and Dangerous World. In M. Hawkesworth & M. Kogan (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics, VOL I*. London: Routledge.
- Rogoff B., Paradise R., Arauz R. M., Correa-Chavez M. & Angelillo C. 2003. First-Hand Learning Through Intent Participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54:175–203.
- Rosenberg, S. W. 1985. Sociology, Psychology, and the Study of Political Behaviour: The Case of Research on Political Socialization. *Journal of Politics*, 47: 715–31.

- Sapiro, V. 2004. Not Your Parents' Socialisation: Introduction for a New Generation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7: 1-23.
- Sayed, Y. 2002. Democratising Education in a Decentralised System: South African Policy and Practice. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 32(1): 35-46.
- Schumann, H. & Scott, J. 1989. Generations and Collective Memories. *American Sociology Review*, 54: 359-81.
- Sears, D. O. & Funk, C. 1999. Evidence of the Long-Term Persistence of Adults' Political Predispositions. *Journal of Politics*, 61: 1-28.
- Sears, D. O. & Levy, S. 2003. Childhood and Adult Political Development. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy & R. Jervis (eds.) *Oxford handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seekings, J. 2010. Race, Class and Inequality in the South African City. Working Paper No. 283. Cape Town: Centre for Social Sciences Research.
- Slomczynski, K. & Shabad, G. 1998. Can Support for Democracy and the Market Be Learnt in School? A Natural Experiment in Post-Communist Poland. *Political Psychology*, 19:749-79.
- Soudien, C. 2007. *Youth Identity in Contemporary South Africa: Race, Culture and Schooling*. Cape Town: New Africa Books.
- Soule, S. 2003. The Crucible of Democracy: Civic Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Spaull, N. 2013. South Africa's Education Crisis: The Quality of Education in South Africa 1994-2011. Johannesburg: CDE.
- Spaull, N. 2015. Education Quality in South Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa: An Economic Approach. PhD Thesis, Stellenbosch University.
- Stoker, L. & Jennings, M. K. 1995. Life Cycle Transitions and Political Participation: The Case of Marriage. *American Political Science Review*, 89: 421-36.
- Stolle, D. & Hooghe, M. 2004. The Roots of Social Capital: Attitudes and Network Mechanisms in the Relation Between Youth and Adult Indicators of Social Capital. *Acta Politica*, 39: 422-41.

- Tedin, K. L. 1974. The Influence of Parents on the Political Attitudes of Adolescents. *American Political Science Review*, 68: 1579-92.
- Tessler, M., Konold, C. & Reif, M. 2004. Political Generations in Developing Countries: Evidence and Insights from Algeria. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68: 184-216.
- The Times. 2016. Jobless Black Youth a Ticking Time Bomb for South Africa. *Times Live*, 20 April. Available: <http://www.timeslive.co.za/thetimes/2016/04/20/Jobless-black-youth-a-ticking-time-bomb-for-South-Africa> [Accessed: 22 April 2016].
- Torney-Purta, J. 2002. The School's Role in Developing Civic Engagement: A Study of Adolescents in Twenty-Eight Countries. *Applied developmental Science*. 6(4): 203-212.
- Torney-Purta, J. 2005. Adolescents' Political Socialisation in Changing Contexts. *Political Psychology*, 25: 465-78.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehman, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. 2001. *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Trafford, B. 2008. Democratic Schools: Towards a Definition. In J. Arthur, I. Davies & C. Hahn (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage Publications.
- VAlly, S. 1999. Teachers in South Africa: Between Fiscal Austerity and Getting Learning Right. *Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, 6(2): 14-16.
- Van den Broeke, A. 1999. Does Differential Cohort Socialisation Matter? The Impact of Cohort Replacement and the Presence of Intergenerational Differences in the Netherlands. *Political Behaviour*, 20: 127-54.
- van der Berg, S. Apartheid's Enduring Legacy: Inequalities in Education. *Journal of African Economies*, 16(5): 849-880.
- Ventura R. 2001. Family Political Socialization in Multiparty Systems. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(6): 666-691.

- Verba, S., Nie, N. H. & Kim, J. 1979. *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Verba, S. & Burns, N. 2005. Family Ties: Understanding the Intergenerational Transmission of Political Participation. In A. S. Zuckerman (ed.) *The Social Logic of Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K. L. & Brady, H. E. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, C. W., Jennings, M. K. & Stoker, L. 2004. The Effects of Social Class Identification on Participatory Orientations Toward Government. *British Journal of Political Science*, 34: 469-95.
- Weeks, F. H. 2012. The Quest for a Culture of Learning: A South African School Perspective. *South African Journal of Education*, 32: 1-14.
- Westholm, A. & Niemi, R. G. 1992. Political Institutions and Political Socialization. *Comparative Politics*, 25: 25-41.
- Westholm, A. 1999. The Perceptual Pathways: Tracing the Mechanisms of Political Value Transfer Across Generations. *Political Psychology*, 20: 525-52.
- Westholm, A., Lindquist, A. & Niemi, R. G. 1990. Education and the Making of the Informed Citizen: Political Literacy and the Outside World. In O. Ichilov (ed.) *Political Socialisation, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Whyte, J. 1998. Political Socialization in a Divided Society: The Case of Northern Ireland. In M. Yates and J. Youniss (eds.) *International Perspectives on Community Service and Political Engagement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfinger, R. E. & Rosenstone, S. J. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.